Pages 2071–2094

FEDERAL REGISTER

VOLUME 25 NUMBER 49

Washington, Friday, March 11, 1960

Contents

(*Continued on next page*)

Codification Guide

The following numerical guide is a list of the parts of each title of the Code of Federal Regulations affected by documents published in today's issue. A cumulative list of parts affected, covering the current month to date, appears at the end of each issue beginning with the second issue of the month.

Monthly, quarterly, and annual cumulative guides, published separately from the daily issues, include the section numbers as well as the part numbers affected.

3 CFR

EXECUTIVE ORDERS:

982 (revoked by EO 10869) 2073
1624 (revoked by EO 10869) 2073
1776 (revoked by EO 10869) 2073
1778 (revoked by EO 10869) 2073
2119 (revoked by EO 10869) 2073
4124 (revoked by EO 10869) 2073
9769 (see EO 10869) 2073
10017 (see EO 10869) 2073
10337 (revoked by EO 10869) 2073
10501 (see Memorandum, March 9, 1960) 2073
10577 (amended by EO 10869) 2073
10869 2073

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS OTHER THAN PROCLAMATIONS AND EXECUTIVE ORDERS:

Memorandum, November 5, 1953 (amended by Memorandum, March 9, 1960) 2073
Memorandum, May 7, 1959 (see Memorandum, March 9, 1960) .. 2073
Memorandum, March 9, 1960 2073

5 CFR

2 2074
6 2074

7 CFR

728 2074

PROPOSED RULES:

904 2086

14 CFR

507 (2 documents) 2077, 2078
600 (5 documents) 2078, 2079
601 (3 documents) 2078, 2079
609 2080

PROPOSED RULES:

600 (3 documents) 2084, 2085
601 (3 documents) 2085, 2086
602 2086
608 2086

15 CFR

230 2083

16 CFR

13 2075

21 CFR

120 2076
121 2076

PROPOSED RULES:

120 (3 documents) 2084

39 CFR

1—203 2077

43 CFR

PUBLIC LAND ORDERS:

2063 2077
2064 2077

FEDERAL REGISTER

REpublic 7-7500 Extension 3261

Published daily, except Sundays, Mondays, and days following official Federal holidays, by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act, approved July 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C., ch. 8B), under regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President. Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

The FEDERAL REGISTER will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $1.50 per month or $15.00 per year, payable in advance. The charge for individual copies (minimum 15 cents) varies in proportion to the size of the issue. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

The regulatory material appearing herein is keyed to the CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS, which is published, under 50 titles, pursuant to section 11 of the Federal Register Act, as amended August 5, 1953. The CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of books and pocket supplements vary.

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the FEDERAL REGISTER, or the CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS.

Presidential Documents

Title 3—THE PRESIDENT

Executive Order 10869

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RULE II, AS PRESCRIBED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 10577 [1] OF NOVEMBER 22, 1954

WHEREAS the appointment of postmasters to fourth-class post offices is controlled in part by regulations approved by the President on November 25, 1912, as amended by Executive Orders No. 1778 of May 7, 1913, No. 4124 of January 12, 1925, No. 9769 of August 14, 1946, No. 10017 of November 10, 1948, and No. 10337 of April 3, 1952; and

WHEREAS it is in the interest of efficiency of operation that the regulations governing the appointment of postmasters of the fourth class be revised and incorporated into the Civil Service Rules as hereinafter set forth:

NOW, THEREFORE, by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 1753 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 631), by the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883 (22 Stat. 403), and by section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code, it is ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 2.1 of Civil Service Rule II, as prescribed by Executive Order No. 10577 of November 22, 1954, is hereby amended by adding thereto a new subsection (c) reading as follows:

"(c) Whenever the Civil Service Commission (1) is unable to certify a sufficient number of names to permit the appointing officer to consider three eligibles for appointment to a fourth-class postmaster position in accordance with the regular procedure, or (2) finds that a particular rate of compensation for fourth-class postmaster positions is too low to warrant regular competitive examinations for such positions, it may authorize appointment to any such position or positions in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by the Commission. Persons appointed under this subsection may acquire competitive status subject to satisfactory completion of a probationary period prescribed by the Commission."

SEC. 2. The following-designated Executive orders and regulations are hereby revoked: Executive Order No. 982 of November 30, 1908; Executive Order No. 1624 of October 15, 1912; the regulations approved by the President on November 25, 1912, governing the appointment of postmasters of the fourth class; Executive Order No. 1776 of May 7, 1913; Executive Order No. 1778 of May 7, 1913; Executive Order No. 2119 of January 12, 1915; Executive Order No. 4124 of January 12, 1925; and Executive Order No. 10337 of April 3, 1952.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

THE WHITE HOUSE,
March 9, 1960.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2320; Filed, Mar. 9, 1960; 5:00 p.m.]

[1] 19 F.R. 7521; 3 CFR, 1954 Supp., p. 84.

Memorandum of March 9, 1960

[DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES SUBJECT TO THE LIMITATIONS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 2 OF E.O. 10501]

Memorandum for the Heads of All Departments and Agencies of the Government

My memorandum of November 5, 1953, relating to Executive Order No. 10501 of November 5, 1953, as supplemented by my memorandum of May 7, 1959, is further supplemented as follows:

1. The provisions of section 2 of Executive Order No. 10501 of November 5, 1953, are hereby made applicable to those agencies of the executive branch, and their constituent agencies, established after November 5, 1953, and listed hereafter in this paragraph; and the agencies so listed and their constituent agencies are hereby designated to have authority for original classification of information and material in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c) of that section, effective as of the respective dates on which such agencies were established:

Council on Foreign Economic Policy
Development Loan Fund
Federal Aviation Agency
Federal Radiation Council
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
National Aeronautics and Space Council
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization
President's Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities

2. All agencies of the executive branch which have been established after November 5, 1953 (except those named in paragraph 1), and all such agencies which may be established hereafter, shall be deemed not to have authority for original classification of information or material under the provisions of section 2 of Executive Order No. 10501, except as such authority may be specifically conferred upon such agencies.

3. This memorandum shall be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

THE WHITE HOUSE,
March 9, 1960.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2319; Filed, Mar. 9, 1960; 5:00 p.m.]

Rules and Regulations

Title 5—ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

Chapter I—Civil Service Commission

PART 2—FILLING COMPETITIVE POSITIONS

CROSS REFERENCE: For amendment of regulations governing the appointment of postmasters of the fourth-class, see Title 3, Executive Order 10869, *supra*.

PART 6—EXCEPTIONS FROM THE COMPETITIVE SERVICE

Department of State

Effective upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER, paragraph (a)(21) of § 6.302, having expired by its own terms, is revoked.

(R.S. 1753, sec. 2, 22 Stat. 403, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 631, 633)

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
[SEAL] MARY V. WENZEL,
Executive Assistant.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2263; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:48 a.m.]

Title 7—AGRICULTURE

Chapter VII—Commodity Stabilization Service (Farm Marketing Quotas and Acreage Allotments), Department of Agriculture

[Amdt. 4]

PART 728—WHEAT

Subpart—Regulations Pertaining to Farm Acreage Allotments for 1960 and Subsequent Crops of Wheat

INCREASED DURUM WHEAT (CLASS II) ALLOTMENTS

Basis and purpose. The amendments herein are issued pursuant to and in accordance with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, including the amendments in Public Law 86-385, and govern the establishment of special 1960 and 1961 farm wheat acreage allotments and marketing quotas for the production of Durum Wheat (Class II) in the counties of Modoc and Siskiyou, California.

The definition of "Durum Wheat (Class II)" is taken from the Official Grain Standards of the United States for wheat. The additional provisions of the regulations are necessary to put into effect the provisions of Public Law 86-385.

Public Law 86-385 provides for a special program for the increased production of Durum Wheat (Class II) for the Tulelake Area of Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, California, for the years 1960 and 1961.

Public Law 86-385 merely extends the identical provisions of Public Law 85-390 applicable to the 1958 and 1959 crops of Durum wheat to the 1960 and 1961 crops of Durum wheat.

One of the primary purposes of the legislation was to provide assistance in an area made up largely of homesteads of 100 acres or less in size. Some of the farmers in the area have acquired additional lands, in the form of either additional homesteads or leased lands, which they operate as single farming units in conjunction with their original homestead tracts. In furthering the legislative intent, special consideration has been given to farms composed of one homestead by making provision for downward adjustments in the allotment indications for farms composed of more than one homestead or containing additional leased land.

In order that producers may proceed with plans for seeding and producing Durum Wheat (Class II) and other wheat as expeditiously as possible, it is hereby found that compliance with the public notice, procedure, and 30-day effective date provisions of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003) is impracticable and contrary to the public interest. Therefore, the amendments herein shall become effective upon the date of their publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

§ 728.1011 [Amendment]

1. Section 728.1011(f)(6) is amended by adding a new subdivision (viii) at the end thereof as follows:

(viii) For 1960 and 1961, for any farm in the Tulelake Area of California to which the provisions of Public Law 86-385 were applicable, the sum of the acreage determined as indicated in subdivision (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi) or (vii) of this subparagraph based on the allotment, plus the special Durum wheat allotment determined for the farm under the provisions of Public Law 86-385.

2. Section 728.1011 is further amended by adding two new paragraphs (i) and (j) to read as follows:

(i) "Durum Wheat (Class II)" means the three subclasses of Durum Wheat (Class II) specified in the Official Grain Standards of the United States for Wheat (Part 26 of this title) which are: Subclass (A) Hard Amber Durum; Sub-class (B) Amber Durum; and Sub-class (C) Durum.

(j) "Other wheat" means wheat other than Durum Wheat (Class II).

3. A new § 728.1026 is added to read as follows:

§ 728.1026 Increase in acreage allotments for production of Durum Wheat (Class II).

(a) The special acreage allotments established under the provisions of this section shall be established by the county committees and shall be reviewed and approved by the State committee or on behalf of the State committee by the State administrative officer, program specialist, or farmer fieldman, and the State committee may revise or require revision of any determination made under regulations in this section, for farms in the irrigable portion of the area known as the Tulelake division of the Klamath project of California, located in Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, California, as defined by the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, on the basis of tillable acreage, crop-rotation practices, type of soil and topography, as provided in paragraphs (b) to (e) of this section.

(b) In order for a farm to be eligible for a special allotment under this section, the owner or operator of the farm must make a written application to the county committee for such allotment on a form prescribed by the Director not later than March 15 of the current year. If the producer is unable to file the written application by such date, he may file a late application, which shall be eligible for a special allotment only if the county committee finds that the producer could not file the application by such date, for reasons beyond his control. Any such late application shall be eligible for a special allotment only to the extent that there is reserve acreage available therefor. The application shall show the acres of cropland on the farm, the cropland suitable for the production of Durum Wheat (Class II) on the basis of the type of soil and topography of the farm, the acreages of Durum Wheat (Class II), other wheat, and each other crop on the farm for the five years previous to the current year, the acreage of each such crop planted or intended to be planted on the farm for the current year, and the special acreage allotment requested for the current year under this section.

(c) The acreage available for allotment under this section shall be 8,000 acres for the current year, less the total acreage allotted to farms in the Tulelake area (as defined in paragraph (a) of this section) under other sections of the regulations in this subpart.

(d) In establishing special allotments under this section, there shall be determined for each eligible farm an allotment indication which shall be (1) the number of acres of cropland on the farm suitable for the production of Durum Wheat (Class II) on the basis of tillable acres, type of soil and topography, less the allotment established for the farm

under other provisions of this subpart (hereinafter referred to as the "original allotment"), multiplied by (2) the ratio of the acreage available for allotment as determined under paragraph (c) of this section to the total acreage on eligible farms in the Tulelake area of cropland suitable for the production of Durum Wheat (Class II) less the total of the original allotments for eligible farms in the area. This allotment indication may be reduced as follows: (i) To reflect the crop-rotation system established or to be established for the farm; and (ii) by limiting the allotment indication for any farm composed of more than one homestead or containing additional leased land to that determined on the basis of 100 acres of cropland suitable for the production of Durum Wheat (Class II). The special allotment shall be determined by apportioning pro rata the acreage available for apportionment among eligible farms on the basis of the adjusted allotment indications, but the special allotment shall not exceed the increase in allotment requested for the farm. Any acreage not apportioned because of being in excess of the acreage requested shall be placed in a reserve and used for the correction of errors, late applications as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, and for upward adjustments in the special allotments hereunder for farms on which the intended acreage of Durum Wheat (Class II) of the current crop would because of crop-rotation practices be in excess of the allotments computed under the formula in this paragraph.

(e) The special allotment for any farm under this section is conditioned upon the use of the allotment for the production of Durum Wheat (Class II), and no wheat produced on such farm shall be eligible for price support. Such special allotment shall be reduced to the extent that it is not so used, and the amount of such reduction shall be placed in the reserve provided for under paragraph (d) of this section.

(f) For the purposes of wheat marketing quotas, the wheat acreage allotment for the farm shall be the sum of the original allotment and the special allotment under this section. The special allotments under this section shall be in addition to national, State, and county wheat acreage allotments for the 1960 and 1961 crop years, and the acreage of Durum Wheat (Class II) on such special allotments shall be considered in establishing future State, county and farm acreage allotments.

(g) The acreage available for allotment under this section shall be divided by the State committee between Modoc and Siskiyou Counties on the basis of the acreage allotted to farms under this section in the respective counties.

(Sec. 375, Stat. 66, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 1375)

Issued at Washington, D.C., this 7th day of March 1960.

CLARENCE D. PALMBY,
Associate Administrator,
Commodity Stabilization Service.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2267; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:49 a.m.]

Title 16—COMMERCIAL PRACTICES

Chapter I—Federal Trade Commission

[Docket 7433 c.o.]

PART 13—PROHIBITED TRADE PRACTICES

Kaiser Rand Corp., et al.

Subpart—Advertising falsely or misleadingly: § 13.15 *Business status, advantages, or connections:* § 13.15–15 *Bonded business;* § 13.20 *Comparative data or merits;* § 13.30 *Composition of goods;* § 13.70 *Fictitious or misleading guarantees;* § 13.110 *Endorsements, approval and testimonials;* § 13.145 *Patent or other rights;* § 13.155 *Prices;* § 13.205 *Scientific or other relevant facts;* § 13.215 *Seals, emblems, or awards;* § 13.265 *Tests and investigations.* Subpart—Claiming or using indorsements or testimonials falsely or misleadingly: § 13.330–90 *United States Government:* § 13.330–90(c) *Bureau of Standards.*

(Sec. 6, 38 Stat. 722; 15 U.S.C. 46. Interpret or apply sec. 5, 38 Stat. 719, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 45) [Cease and desist order, Kaiser Rand Corp., et al., Redondo Beach, Calif., Docket 7433, February 12, 1960]

In the Matter of Kaiser Rand Corporation, a Corporation, Car Parts Manufacturing Corporation, a Corporation, The Cadmium Battery Corporation, a Corporation, Life-Long Battery Manufacturing Corporation, a Corporation, Life-Long Manufacturing Corporation, a Corporation, Ardmore Investment Company, Inc., a Corporation, Jack Morgan Watt, Individually and as an Officer of Said Corporations

This proceeding was heard by a hearing examiner on the complaint of the Commission charging an individual and the five companies of which he was president, all of Redondo Beach, Calif., with using deceptive pricing quality and guarantee claims and other misrepresentations to sell their electric storage batteries, battery additives, oil filters and other products, as in the order below set forth. After acceptance of an agreement containing a consent order, the hearing examiner made his initial decision and order to cease and desist which became on February 12 the decision of the Commission.

The order to cease and desist is as follows:

It is ordered, That Kaiser Rand Corporation, Car Parts Manufacturing Corporation, Life-Long Manufacturing Corporation, Life-Long Battery Corporation, all corporations, their officers, and Jack Morgan Watt, individually and as an officer of said corporate respondents and respondents' agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the offering for sale, sale or distribution, of electric storage batteries, battery additives, oil filters or any other product in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from representing, directly or by implication:

1. That their batteries:

a. Are comparable in design or function to the solar battery.

b. Contain silicones.

c. Never require the addition of water to their cells.

d. Are anything other than lead-acid batteries.

e. Have sold for $100.

f. Will start any engine one million times, or any particular number of times in normal use.

2. That any product:

a. Is guaranteed in any respect unless respondents in fact comply with the represented guarantee.

b. Was conceived or is constructed upon new and revolutionary principles of design or function.

c. Is sold with a guarantee the performance of which is insured by Lloyd's of London or any other independent bonding or insurance company.

d. Is patented or is the object of an existing, valid patent application unless at the time of the representation, there is existing in the United States Patent Office a patent or an existing patent application incorporating the advertised product.

e. Has been awarded a prize, citation or any kind of an award by an independent organization conferring such awards.

f. Has been approved by any department, bureau or agency of the United States Government.

g. Is advertised or will be advertised by respondents in any publication or through any media unless respondents do in fact place such advertisements in the publication or media represented.

h. Has been sold at any price unless that product has been offered for sale or has been sold by respondents in recent regular course of business at the price represented.

i. Is comparable in design or function to any other product, or that its characteristics are derived from such other product, unless in fact, there is a substantial similarity in design or function.

j. Will convert a lead-acid battery into an alkaline nickel-cadmium battery or its equivalent.

k. Contains silicone or any other substance, unless said product does in fact contain the substance represented, and unless it serves a useful function in the construction or operation of that product.

3. That test reports disseminated by respondents are results of tests performed on respondents' products by independent, unbiased research and testing organizations.

4. That reports of tests performed on any of respondents' products by independent, unbiased research and testing organizations are authentic and unbiased when in fact they have been altered, recopied, added to or subtracted from by respondents or their agents.

5. That any person, corporation or organization of any kind has approved, recommended or expressed satisfaction with any of respondents' products unless

respondents have been formally notified of that fact by such person or a responsible official of the named corporation or organization.

It is further ordered, That respondent Ardmore Investment Company, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Jack Morgan Watt, individually and as an officer of said corporate respondent, and respondents' agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the offering for sale, sale or distribution of any product in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from: Representing directly, or by implication, that respondent Ardmore Investment Company, Inc., is a state chartered bonding company, or an independent bonding or insurance company of any kind.

By "Decision of the Commission," etc., report of compliance was required as follows:

It is ordered, That respondents Kaiser Rand Corporation, Car Parts Manufacturing Corporation, Life-Long Manufacturing Corporation, Life-Long Battery Corporation, Ardmore Investment Company, Inc., all corporations, and respondent Jack Morgan Watt, individually and as an officer of each corporate respondent herein named, shall within sixty (60) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission a report in writing setting forth in detail the manner and form in which they have complied with the order to cease and desist.

Issued: February 12, 1960.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ROBERT M. PARRISH, *Secretary.*

[F.R. Doc. 60-2244; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:46 a.m.]

Title 21—FOOD AND DRUGS

Chapter I—Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

SUBCHAPTER B—FOOD AND FOOD PRODUCTS

PART 120—TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FROM TOLERANCES FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICALS IN OR ON RAW AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Tolerances for Residues of Maleic Hydrazide

A petition was filed with the Food and Drug Administration by Naugatuck Chemical Division of United States Rubber Company, Naugatuck, Connecticut, requesting the establishment of tolerances for residues of maleic hydrazide in or on onions and potatoes. Announcement of the filing appeared in the FEDERAL REGISTER of June 9, 1959 (24 F.R. 4664).

The Secretary of Agriculture has certified that this pesticide chemical is useful for the purposes for which tolerances are being established.

After consideration of the data submitted in the petition and other relevant material which show that the tolerances established by this order will protect the public health, and by virtue of the authority vested in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 408(d)(2), 68 Stat. 512; 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(2)) and delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs by the Secretary (21 CFR, 1958 Supp., 120.7(g)), the regulations for tolerances for pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities (21 CFR Part 120) are amended by adding thereto the following new section:

§ 120.175 Tolerances for residues of maleic hydrazide.

Tolerances for residues of maleic hydrazide (1,2-dihydro-3,6-pyridazinedione) in or on raw agricultural commodities are established as follows:

(a) 50 parts per million in or on potatoes.

(b) 15 parts per million in or on onions (dry bulb).

Any person who will be adversely affected by the foregoing order may at any time prior to the thirtieth day from the date of its publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER file with the Hearing Clerk, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Room 5440, 330 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 25, D.C., written objections thereto. Objections shall show wherein the person filing will be adversely affected by the order, specify with particularity the provisions of the order deemed objectionable, and the grounds for the objections. If a hearing is requested, the objections must state the issues for the hearing. A hearing will be granted if the objections are supported by grounds legally sufficient to justify the relief sought. Objections may be accompanied by a memorandum or brief in support thereof. All documents shall be filed in quintuplicate.

Effective date. This order shall be effective upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

(Sec. 408(d)(2), 68 Stat. 512; 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(2))

Dated: March 4, 1960.

[SEAL] GEO. P. LARRICK, *Commissioner of Food and Drugs.*

[F.R. Doc. 60-2256; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:48 a.m.]

PART 121—FOOD ADDITIVES

Subpart D—Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption

MALEIC HYDRAZIDE IN POTATO CHIPS

The Commissioner of Food and Drugs, having evaluated the data submitted in a petition filed by the Naugatuck Chemical Division of United States Rubber Company, Naugatuck, Connecticut, and other relevant material, has concluded that maleic hydrazide residues in potato chips are safe when such residues are present as a result of the use of maleic hydrazide on the growing plants as a sprout inhibitor, and in an amount not to exceed that established in this order. Therefore, pursuant to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 409(c)(1), 72 Stat. 1786; 21 U.S.C. 348(c)(1)), and under the authority delegated to the Commissioner by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (23 F.R. 9500), Subpart D—Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption (21 CFR Part 121 (23 F.R. 2434)) is amended by adding thereto the following section:

§ 121.1006 Maleic hydrazide in potato chips.

A food additive known as maleic hydrazide (1,2-dihydro-3,6-pyridazinedione) may be present in potato chips when used in accordance with the following conditions:

(a) The food additive is present as a result of the application of a pesticide formulation containing maleic hydrazide to the growing potato plant in accordance with directions registered by the United States Department of Agriculture.

(b) The label of the pesticide formulation containing the food additive conforms to labeling registered by the United States Department of Agriculture.

(c) The food additive is present in an amount not to exceed 160 parts per million (0.0160 percent) by weight of the finished food.

Any person who will be adversely affected by the foregoing order may at any time prior to the thirtieth day from the date of its publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER file with the Hearing Clerk, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Room 5440, 330 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 25, D.C., written objections thereto. Objections shall show wherein the person filing will be adversely affected by the order, specify with particularity the provisions of the order deemed objectionable, and the grounds for the objections. If a hearing is requested, the objections must state the issues for the hearing. A hearing will be granted if the objections are supported by grounds legally sufficient to justify the relief sought. Objections may be accompanied by a memorandum or brief in support thereof. All documents shall be filed in quintuplicate.

Effective date. This order shall be effective upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

(Sec. 409(c), 72 Stat. 1786; 21 U.S.C. 348(c))

Dated: March 4, 1960.

[SEAL] GEO. P. LARRICK, *Commissioner of Food and Drugs.*

[F.R. Doc. 60-2257; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:48 a.m.]

Title 39—POSTAL SERVICE

Chapter I—Post Office Department

FOURTH-CLASS POSTMASTERS

CROSS REFERENCE: For amendment of regulations governing the appointment of postmasters of the fourth-class, see Title 3, Executive Order 10869, *supra*.

Title 43—PUBLIC LANDS: INTERIOR

Chapter I—Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior

APPENDIX—PUBLIC LAND ORDERS

[Public Land Order 2063]

[84021]

ALASKA

Power Site Cancellation No. 144; Revoking Departmental Order of September 13, 1927; Partly Revoking Departmental Order of May 14, 1929; (Power Site Classifications No. 188 and No. 221)

By virtue of the authority contained in the act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 394; 43 U.S.C. 31), and as Secretary of the Interior, and pursuant to determination DA-72-Alaska of the Federal Power Commission issued November 30, 1959, it is ordered as follows:

1. The departmental order of September 13, 1927, creating Power Site Classification No. 188, and the departmental order of May 14, 1929, creating Power Site Classification No. 221, are hereby revoked so far as they affect the following-described lands:

BARANOF ISLAND

Beginning at corner No. 1 on north shore of Warm Springs Bay, approximately in latitude 57° N., longitude 135° W., a sawed post 2" x 4" x 4' set in a mound of rock and marked M C 1; thence by meanders along the line of mean high tide of Warm Springs Bay to corner No. 2 a sawed stake 2" x 4" x 3" set in a crevice in a ledge of rock and marked M C 2; thence due north 6.82 chains to corner No. 3, not set; thence due east 11.96 chains to corner No. 4, not set; thence due south 7.27 chains to corner No. 1 N C, the place of beginning, containing 5.75 acres.

2. The lands are located on the north shore of Warm Springs Bay, on the east side of Baranof Island, Alaska.

3. Subject to any valid existing rights, and the requirements of applicable law, the lands are hereby opened to settlement and to filing of applications, selections, and locations in accordance with the following:

a. Applications and selections under the nonmineral public land laws may be presented to the Manager mentioned below on the date of this order. Such applications and selections will be considered as filed on the hour and respective dates shown for the various classes enumerated in the following paragraphs:

(1) Until 10:00 a.m. on June 3, 1960, the State of Alaska shall have a preferred right of application to select the lands in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the act of July 28, 1956 (70 Stat. 709; 48 U.S.C. 46-3b), and section 6(g) of the Alaska Statehood Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339; Public Law 85-508). During this period, the State may also apply for the reservation to it or to any of its political subdivisions, under any law or regulation applicable thereto, of any of the lands required for rights-of-way or material sites in accordance with the provisions of section 24 of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1075; 16 U.S.C. 818), as amended.

(2) All valid applications under the nonmineral public land laws other than those coming under subparagraph (1) above, presented prior to 10:00 a.m. on April 9, 1960, will be considered as simultaneously filed at that hour. Any rights under such applications filed thereafter will be governed by the time of filing.

(3) All applications under subparagraphs (1) and (2) above shall be subject to those from persons having prior existing valid settlement rights, preference rights conferred by existing law, and equitable claims subject to allowance and confirmation.

(4) The lands have been open to applications and offers under the mineral leasing laws, and to location under the United States mining laws. They will be open to settlement under the homestead and Alaska homesite laws at 10:00 a.m. on June 3, 1960.

4. Persons claiming preference rights based upon valid settlement, statutory preference, or equitable claims must enclose properly corroborated statements in support of their applications, setting forth all facts relvant to their claims. Detailed rules and regulations governing applications which may be filed pursuant to this notice can be found in Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Inquiries concerning the lands should be addressed to the Manager, Land Office, Bureau of Land Management, Juneau, Alaska.

ROGER ERNST,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

MARCH 4, 1960.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2246; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:46 a.m.]

[Public Land Order 2064]

[Arizona 017512]

ARIZONA

Reclamation Withdrawal; Salt River Project

By virtue of the authority contained in section 3 of the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388; 43 U.S.C. 416), it is ordered as follows:

Subject to valid existing rights, the following described public lands are hereby withdrawn in the first form from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, and reserved for use by the Bureau of Reclamation for irrigation works in connection with the Salt River Project:

GILA AND SALT RIVER MERIDIAN

T. 3 N., R. 3 E.,
Sec. 34, E½NE¼;
Sec. 35, W½NW¼.

Containing 160 acres.

ROGER ERNST,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

MARCH 7, 1960.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2247; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:47 a.m.]

Title 14—AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

Chapter III—Federal Aviation Agency

SUBCHAPTER C—AIRCRAFT REGULATIONS

[Reg. Docket No. 229; Amdt. 114]

PART 507—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

Continental "E" Series Engines

A proposal to amend Part 507 of the regulations of the Administrator to include an airworthiness directive requiring modification of certain generators used in Continental engines was published in 25 F.R. 250.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of the amendment. No objections were received.

In consideration of the foregoing § 507.10(a), (14 CFR Part 507), is hereby amended by adding the following new airworthiness directives:

CONTINENTAL. Applies to E165, E185, and E225 Series engines equipped with Delco-Remy generators P/N 1101886, 1101887, 1101888, and 1101908.

Compliance required at next periodic inspection, engine overhaul or generator removal whichever occurs first, but in any case not later than December 31, 1960.

To prevent failure of the generator drive gear retaining nut internal tooth lockwasher (CMC P/N 531232) remove the generator and inspect the generator drive to determine whether the internal tooth lockwasher or the plain flat washer (CMC P/N 401507) is installed. If the internal tooth lockwasher is installed, remove it and install the flat washer. (Note: The flat washer is not an aircraft standard part.) Use a new retaining nut (CMC P/N 531231, Esna P/N 29NTE-064 or equivalent) for reassembly. Apply a torque of 175-195 in.-lb. to the nut.

(Continental Motors Corporation Service Bulletin M57-4 covers this same subject.)

(Sec. 313(a), 601, 603; 72 Stat. 752, 775, 776; 49 U.S.C. 1354(a), 1421, 1423)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 7, 1960.

JAMES T. PYLE,
Acting Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2227; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:45 a.m.]

[Reg. Docket No. 149; Amdt. 113]

PART 507—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

Boeing 707; Flight Recorder Power Switch

A proposal to amend Part 507 of the regulations of the Administrator to include an airworthiness directive requiring modification of the flight recorder power switch on Boeing 707 Series aircraft was published in 24 F.R. 8188.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of the amendment. Comments were received objecting to the requirement of the three-position manually operated switch on the basis that the oleo actuated switch is satisfactory. Evaluation of flight recorder data does not support this. The only substantive changes to the proposed directive are to eliminate requirements for instructions and directions in the Airplane Flight Manual. These will be incorporated in the operations manuals.

In consideration of the foregoing § 507.10(a), (14 CFR Part 507), is hereby amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

BOEING. Applies to all 707 Series aircraft operating in accordance with Parts 40, 41, and 42 of the Civil Air Regulations.

Compliance required as indicated.

As a result of detailed examinations of flight recorder data subsequent to recent incidents involving 707 Series aircraft, it has been determined that the prime power switch for the flight recorder, now actuated by the displacement of a landing gear oleo strut, does not insure all elements of the flight recorder to be operating at the start of the takeoff roll and continuing until the landing is completed at an airport. Therefore the following modification shall be accomplished as indicated.

Unless already accomplished, compliance required not later than May 15, 1960.

Install a three-position switch, AN3027-8 type or equivalent, in the pilot compartment and connect to appropriate circuits in the flight recorder for "TEST-OFF-ON" functions. Switch positions shall be appropriately marked.

Removal of the presently installed oleo actuated power switch is optional, and if not removed, it shall not be considered as an equivalent to the required three-position manually operated switch.

(Boeing Service Bulletin No. 77 (R-1) pertains to the circuity revision.)

(Sec. 313(a), 601, 603; 72 Stat. 752, 775, 776; 49 U.S.C. 1354(a), 1421, 1423.)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 7, 1960.

JAMES T. PYLE,
Acting Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2228; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:45 a.m.]

SUBCHAPTER E—AIR NAVIGATION REGULATIONS

[Airspace Docket No. 59-WA-367; Amdt. 193]

PART 600—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS

Modification

The purpose of this amendment to § 600.6045 of the regulations of the Administrator is to modify the segment of VOR Federal airway No. 45 and its associated control areas between Raleigh, N.C., and New Bern, N.C.

A segment of Victor 45 presently extends from the Raleigh VOR to the New Bern VOR via the intersection of the Raleigh VOR 116° and the New Bern VOR 305° True radials. The Federal Aviation Agency is modifying this segment of Victor 45 via a VOR to be commissioned on or about May 5, 1960, near Kinston, N.C., at latitude 35°22'12" N., longitude 77°33'30" W., in order to provide more precise navigational guidance. This facility will be located directly under the airway as presently designated and no realignment of this segment of the airway is involved. This action will result in this segment of Victor 45 extending from the Raleigh VOR to the New Bern VOR via the Kinston VOR. The control areas associated with Victor 45 are so designated that they will automatically conform to the modified airway. Accordingly, no amendment relating to such control areas is necessary.

Since this amendment imposes no additional burden on the public, compliance with the notice, public procedure, and effective date requirements of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act is unnecessary. However, since it is necessary that sufficient time be allowed to permit appropriate changes to be made on aeronautical charts, this amendment will become effective more than 30 days after publication.

In consideration of the foregoing, and pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (24 F.R. 4530) § 600.6045 (24 F.R. 10511, 25 F.R. 859) is amended as follows:

In the text of § 600.6045 *VOR Federal airway No. 45 (New Bern, N.C., to Charleston, W. Va., Lexington, Ky., to Waterville, Ohio, and Tipton, Mich., to Saginaw, Mich.)*, delete "INT of the New Bern VOR 305° and the Raleigh VOR 116° radials;" and substitute therefor "Kinston, N.C., VOR;".

This amendment shall become effective 0001 e.s.t. June 2, 1960.

(Secs. 307(a), 313(a), 72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 7, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2229; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:45 a.m.]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-WA-397; Amdt. 122]

PART 600—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS

Modification

On December 5, 1959, a notice of proposed rule-making was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (24 F.R. 9790) stating that the Federal Aviation Agency proposed the modification of a segment of VOR Federal airway No. 113 between paso Robles, Calif., and Los Banos, Calif., via a VOR to be commissioned approximately February 15, 1960, near Priest, Calif.

The coordinates of the Priest VOR in the notice were approximate. Subsequent to the notice, the coordinates have been determined to be latitude 36°08'29" N., longitude 120°39'54" W. This change is minor in nature in that it represents a correction of only 12 seconds of latitude and 3 seconds of longitude and necessitates no change in the proposed amendment. Also, the commissioning date has been rescheduled to June 3, 1960.

No adverse comments were received regarding the proposed amendment.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of the rule herein adopted, and due consideration has been given to all relevant matter presented.

The substance of the proposed amendment having been published, and pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (24 F.R. 4530), § 601.6113 (24 F.R. 10516, 25 F.R. 630) is hereby amended and set forth below:

§ 600.6113 VOR Federal airway No. 113 (Paso Robles, Calif., to Reno, Nev.).

From the Paso Robles, Calif., VOR via the Priest, Calif., VOR; Los Banos, Calif., VOR; Stockton, Calif., VOR; Linden, Calif., VOR; INT of the Linden VOR 046° T and the Reno VOR 208° T radials; to the Reno, Nev., VOR. The portion of this airway which lies within the geographic limits of, and between the designated altitudes of, the Vernalis Restricted Area (R-280) is excluded during its time of designation.

This amendment shall become effective 0001 e.s.t. June 30, 1960.

(Secs. 307(a), 313(a), 72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 7, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2233; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:45 a.m.]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-KC-34]

[Amdt. 212]

PART 600—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS

[Amdt. 244]

PART 601—DESIGNATION OF THE CONTINENTAL CONTROL AREA, CONTROL AREAS, CONTROL ZONES, REPORTING POINTS, AND POSITIVE CONTROL ROUTE SEGMENTS

Revocation of Federal Airway, Associated Control Areas, Redesignation of Reporting Point and Modification of Control Area Extension

On October 29, 1959, a notice of proposed rule-making was published in the

FEDERAL REGISTER (24 F.R. 8800) stating that the Federal Aviation Agency proposed to revoke in its entirety Blue Federal airway No. 42, and its associated control areas, between Goshen, Ind., and Saginaw, Mich.; the designated reporting point Battle Creek, Mich., radio range station now associated with Blue Federal airway No. 42 would be redesignated with Red Federal airway No. 63; and the Lansing, Mich., control area extension would be redescribed by the use of VOR Federal airway No. 274.

No comment was received regarding the proposed amendments.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of the rules herein adopted, and due consideration has been given to all relevant matter presented.

Pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (24 F.R. 4530) and for the reasons set forth in the notice, the proposed amendments are hereby adopted without change and set forth below:

§ 600.642 [Revocation]

1. Section 600.642 *Blue Federal airway No. 42 (Goshen, Ind., to Saginaw, Mich.)* is revoked.

§ 601.642 [Revocation]

2. Section 601.642 *Blue Federal airway No. 42 control areas (Goshen, Ind., to Saginaw, Mich.)* is revoked.

§ 601.4642 [Revocation]

3. Section 601.4642 *Blue Federal airway No. 42 (Goshen, Ind., to Saginaw, Mich.)* is revoked.

§ 601.4263 [Amendment]

4. In the text of § 601.4263 *Red Federal airway No. 63 (Bangor, Mich., to Jackson, Mich.)*, delete "No reporting point designation." and substitute therefor, "Battle Creek, Mich., RR."

5. Section 601.1261 is amended to read:

§ 601.1261 Control area extension (Lansing, Mich.).

The airspace within a 15-mile radius of the Lansing VOR, and within 5 miles either side of the NW course of the Lansing RR extending from the RR to VOR Federal airway No. 274. The airspace S of Lansing bounded on the S by VOR Federal airway No. 100, on the NW by VOR Federal airway No. 218, and on the NE by VOR Federal airway No. 45.

These amendments shall become effective 0001 e.s.t. May 5, 1960.

(Secs. 307(a), 313(a), 72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 7, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2230; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:45 a.m.]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-WA-306]

[Amdt. 226]

PART 600—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS

[Amdt. 271]

PART 601—DESIGNATION OF THE CONTINENTAL CONTROL AREA, CONTROL AREAS, CONTROL ZONES, REPORTING POINTS, AND POSITIVE CONTROL ROUTE SEGMENTS

Modification of Federal Airways and Associated Control Areas

On December 12, 1959, a notice of proposed rule-making was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (24 F.R. 10080) stating that the Federal Aviation Agency was proposing to modify VOR Federal airway No. 129 from Polo, Ill., to Eau Claire, Wis., and VOR Federal airway No. 24 between Rochester, Minn., and Lone Rock, Wis.

No adverse comments were received regarding the proposed amendments.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of the rules herein adopted, and due consideration has been given to all relevant matter presented.

The substance of the proposed amendments having been published, therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (24 F.R. 4530), and for the reasons set forth in the notice, §§ 600.6129 (24 F.R. 10517), 600.6024 (24 F.R. 10509; 25 F.R. 107, 854), and § 601.6024 (24 F.R. 10599) are amended as follows:

1. Section 600.6129 is amended to read:

§ 600.6129 VOR Federal airway No. 129 (Polo, Ill., to Eau Claire, Wis.).

From the Polo, Ill., VOR via the Rewey, Wis., VOR; Waukon, Iowa, VOR; Nodine, Minn., VOR to the Eau Claire, Wis., VOR.

2. Section 600.6024 is amended to read:

§ 600.6024 VOR Federal airway No. 24 (Aberdeen, S. Dak., to Lone Rock, Wis.).

From the Aberdeen, S. Dak., VOR via the Watertown, S. Dak., VORTAC, including a N alternate; Redwood Falls, Minn., VOR, including a N alternate via the INT of the Watertown VORTAC 086° T and the Redwood Falls VOR 305° T radials; Rochester, Minn., VOR; to the Lone Rock, Wis., VOR, including a S alternate from the Rochester VOR to the Lone Rock VOR via the Waukon, Iowa, VOR.

3. Section 601.6024 is amended to read:

§ 601.6024 VOR Federal airway No. 24 control areas (Aberdeen, S. Dak., to Lone Rock, Wis.).

All of VOR Federal airway No. 24 including N alternates and a S alternate.

These amendments shall become effective 0001 e.s.t. May 5, 1960.

(Secs. 307(a), 313(a), 72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 7, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2231; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:45 a.m.]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-WA-350]

[Amdt. 220]

PART 600—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS

[Amdt. 259]

PART 601—DESIGNATION OF THE CONTINENTAL CONTROL AREA, CONTROL AREAS, CONTROL ZONES, REPORTING POINTS, AND POSITIVE CONTROL ROUTE SEGMENTS

Designation of VOR Federal Airway and Associated Control Area

On November 25, 1959, a notice of proposed rule-making was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (24 F.R. 9480) stating that the Federal Aviation Agency proposed the designation of VOR Federal airway No. 482 from Las Vegas, N. Mex., to Liberal, Kans.

No adverse comments were received regarding the proposed amendment.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of the rules herein adopted, and due consideration has been given to all relevant matter presented.

The substance of the proposed amendments having been published, and pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (24 F.R. 4530), Part 600 (24 F.R. 10487) and Part 601 (24 F.R. 10530) are hereby amended by adding the following sections:

§ 600.6482 VOR Federal airway No. 482 (Las Vegas, N. Mex., to Liberal, Kans.).

From the Las Vegas, N. Mex., VOR via the Clayton, N. Mex., VOR to the Liberal, Kans., VOR.

§ 601.6482 VOR Federal airway No. 482 control areas (Las Vegas, N. Mex., to Liberal, Kans.).

All of VOR Federal airway No. 482.

These amendments shall become effective 0001 e.s.t. August 25, 1960.

(Secs. 307(a) and 313(a), 72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 7, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2232; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:45 a.m.]

[Reg. Docket No. 303; Amdt. 158]

PART 609—STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURES

Miscellaneous Alterations

The new and revised standard instrument approach procedures appearing hereinafter are adopted to become effective and/or canceled when indicated in order to promote safety. The revised procedures supersede the existing procedures of the same classification now in effect for the airports specified therein. For the convenience of the users, the revised procedures specify the complete procedure and indicate the changes to the existing procedures. Pursuant to authority delegated to me by the Administrator (24 F.R. 5662), I find that a situation exists requiring immediate action in the interest of safety, that notice and public procedure hereon are impracticable, and that good cause exists for making this amendment effective on less than thirty days' notice.

Part 609 (14 CFR Part 609) is amended as follows:

1. The low or medium frequency range procedures prescribed in § 609.100(a) are amended to read in part:

LFR STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURE

Bearings, headings, courses and radials are magnetic. Elevations and altitudes are in feet MSL. Ceilings are in feet above airport elevation. Distances are in nautical miles unless otherwise indicated, except visibilities which are in statute miles.

If an instrument approach procedure of the above type is conducted at the below named airport, it shall be in accordance with the following instrument approach procedure, unless an approach is conducted in accordance with a different procedure for such airport authorized by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. Initial approaches shall be made over specified routes. Minimum altitudes shall correspond with those established for en route operation in the particular area or as set forth below.

Transition				Ceiling and visibility minimums			
From—	To—	Course and distance	Minimum altitude (feet)	Condition	2-engine or less		More than 2-engine, more than 65 knots
					65 knots or less	More than 65 knots	
Little Rock VOR	LIT-LFR	Direct	1300	T-dn	300–1	300–1	200–½
				C-dn	500–1	600–1	600–1½
				S-dn-32	500–1	500–1	500–1
				A-dn	800–2	800–2	800–2

Procedure turn E side SE crs, 133° Outbnd, 313° Inbnd, 1500′ within 10 miles.
Minimum altitude over facility on final approach crs, 1000′.
Crs and distance, facility to airport, 315°—3.3.
If visual contact not established upon descent to authorized landing minimums or if landing not accomplished within 3.3 miles turn left, climb to 3200 on NW crs within 20 miles, or when directed by ATC, (1) turn right, climb to 1500′ on NE crs within 20 mi, or (2) turn left, climb to 1800′ and proceed direct to LOM.
NOTE: Not less than 300–1 authorized for takeoff on runways 17, 35, 32.
Major Change: Deletes transition from Keo FM.

City, Little Rock; State, Ark.; Airport Name, Adams; Elev., 257′; Fac. Class., SBRAZ; Ident., LIT; Procedure No. 1, Amdt. 15; Eff. Date, 2 Apr. 60; Sup. Amdt. No. 14; Dated, 13 Dec. 58

2. The automatic direction finding procedures prescribed in § 609.100(b) are amended to read in part:

ADF STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURE

Bearings, headings, courses and radials are magnetic. Elevations and altitudes are in feet MSL. Ceilings are in feet above airport elevation. Distances are in nautical miles unless otherwise indicated, except visibilities which are in statute miles.

If an instrument approach procedure of the above type is conducted at the below named airport, it shall be in accordance with the following instrument approach procedure, unless an approach is conducted in accordance with a different procedure for such airport authorized by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. Initial approaches shall be made over specified routes. Minimum altitudes shall correspond with those established for en route operation in the particular area or as set forth below.

Transition				Ceiling and visibility minimums			
From—	To—	Course and distance	Minimum altitude (feet)	Condition	2-engine or less		More than 2-engine, more than 65 knots
					65 knots or less	More than 65 knots	
Charlotte LFR	LOM	Direct	2100	T-dn	300–1	300–1	200–½
Int N crs Charlotte LFR and SW crs ILS	LOM	Direct	2200	C-dn	400–1	500–1	500–1½
Union Int	Clover Int*	Direct	2300	S-dn-5	400–1	400–1	400–1
Ft. Mill VOR	Clover Int*	Direct	2300	A-dn	800–2	800–2	800–2
Clover Int*	LOM (Final)	Direct	1500				
York Int	Clover Int*	Direct	2200				
Bradley Int	LOM	Direct	2100				
Mt. Holly Int	LOM	Direct	2300				
Weddington Int	LOM	Direct	2100				
Waco Int	LOM	Direct	2900				

Procedure turn N side of SW crs, 229° Outbnd, 049° Inbnd, 2300′ within 10 miles.
Minimum altitude over LOM inbnd final, 1500′.
Crs and distance, facility to airport, 049°—4.6 mi.
If visual contact not established upon descent to authorized landing minimums or if landing not accomplished within 4.6 mi of LOM, climb to 2200′ on crs of 049° from LOM within 20 miles or, when directed by ATC, turn left, climb to 3000′ on FML-VOR R-006 to Mt. Holly Int or turn right, climb to 2100′ on R-006 to FML-VOR.
*Clover Int: Int R-328 FML-VOR and CLT-ILS SW crs. (To be shown on AL chart only.)

City, Charlotte; State, N.C.; Airport Name, Douglas; Elev., 748′; Fac. Class., LOM; Ident., CL; Procedure No. 1, Amdt. 13; Eff. Date. 2 Apr. 60; Sup. Amdt. No. 12 (ADF portion of Comb. ILS-ADF); Dated, 22 Mar. 58

3. The very high frequency omnirange (VOR) procedures prescribed in § 609.100(c) are amended to read in part:

VOR STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURE

Bearings, headings, courses and radials are magnetic. Elevations and altitudes are in feet MSL. Ceilings are in feet above airport elevation. Distances are in nautical miles unless otherwise indicated, except visibilities which are in statute miles.

If an instrument approach procedure of the above type is conducted at the below named airport, it shall be in accordance with the following instrument approach procedure, unless an approach is conducted in accordance with a different procedure for such airport authorized by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. Initial approaches shall be made over specified routes. Minimum altitudes shall correspond with those established for en route operation in the particular area or as set forth below.

Transition				Ceiling and visibility minimums			
From—	To—	Course and distance	Minimum altitude (feet)	Condition	2-engine or less		More than 2-engine, more than 65 knots
					65 knots or less	More than 65 knots	
Columbus LFR	UBS-VOR	Direct	1500	T-dn C-dn A-du#	300-1 600-1 800-2	300-1 600-1 800-2	200-½ 600-1½ 800-2

Procedure turn S side of crs, 275° Outbnd, 095° Inbnd, 1700′ within 10 mi. Beyond 10 mi NA.
Minimum altitude over facility on final approach crs, 900′.
Crs and distance, facility to airport, 095°—6.7 mi.
If visual contact not established upon descent to authorized landing minimums or if landing not accomplished within 6.7 mi, climb to 1700′ on crs of 095° within 20 mi.
NOTE: Weather service not available to public.
AIR CARRIER NOTE: Procedure may be authorized for air carriers having approval of their arrangement for weather service at this airport.
#Alternate usage authorized for air carriers only.

City, Columbus; State, Miss.; Airport Name, Columbus Loundes County; Elev., 186′; Fac. Class., BVOR; Ident., UBS; Procedure No. 1, Amdt. 1; Eff. Date, 2 Apr. 60; Sup. Amdt. No. Orig.; Dated, 4 July 59

Little Rock LFR	LIT-VOR	Direct	1300	T-dn C-dn S-dn-32 A-dn	300-1 500-1 500-1 800-2	300-1 600-1 500-1 800-2	200-½ 600-1½ 500-1 800-2

Procedure turn E side crs, 134° Outbnd, 314° Inbnd, 1500′ within 10 miles.
Minimum altitude over facility on final approach crs, 1000′.
Crs and distance, facility to airport, 314°—3.8.
If visual contact not established upon descent to authorized landing minimums or if landing not accomplished within 3.8 miles, turn left, climb to 3200 on R-295 within 20 miles, or when directed by ATC, (1) turn right to 100° M, intercept and climb to 1500′ on R-055 within 20 mi or (2) turn left, climb to 1800′ and proceed direct to LOM.
AIR CARRIER NOTE: Not less than 300-1 authorized for takeoff on Runway 17, 32, 35.
Major Change: Deletes transition from Keo FM.

City, Little Rock; State, Ark.; Airport Name, Adams; Elev., 257′; Fac. Class., BVOR; Ident., LIT; Procedure No. 1, Amdt. 6; Eff. Date, 2 Apr 60; Sup. Amdt. No. 5; Dated, 13 Dec. 58

4. The terminal very high frequency omnirange (TerVOR) procedures prescribed in § 609.200 are amended to read in part:

TERMINAL VOR STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURE

Bearings, headings, courses and radials are magnetic. Elevations and altitudes are in feet MSL. Ceilings are in feet above airport elevation. Distances are in nautical miles unless otherwise indicated, except visibilities which are in statute miles.

If an instrument approach procedure of the above type is conducted at the below named airport, it shall be in accordance with the following instrument approach procedure, unless an approach is conducted in accordance with a different procedure for such airport authorized by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. Initial approaches shall be made over specified routes. Minimum altitudes shall correspond with those established for en route operation in the particular area or as set forth below.

Transition				Ceiling and visibility minimums			
From—	To—	Course and distance	Minimum altitude (feet)	Condition	2-engine or less		More than 2-engine, more than 65 knots
					65 knots or less	More than 65 knots	
OM or 5 mi Radar Fix	VOR (Final)	133°—5.0	1000	T-dn C-dn* S-dn*-13 A-dn	300-1 400-1 400-1 800-2	300-1 500-1 400-1 800-2	200-½ 500-1½ 400-1 800-2

Radar transition altitude within 20 mi radius of airport 2000′ MSL. Radar control must provide 3 mi or 1000′ vertical separation; or 3 to 5 mi and 500′ vertical separation from radio towers: 2349′ MSL 15 mi SSE; 1743′ MSL 12 mi WSW; 1221′ MSL 6 mi N.
Procedure turn #N side crs, 313° Outbnd, 133° Inbnd, 2200′ within 10 mi.
Facility on airport.
Minimum altitude over facility on final approach crs, *1000′
Crs and distance, breakoff point to appr end Rnwy 13, 129°—0.91 mi.
If visual contact not established upon descent to authorized landing minimums or if landing not acomplished proceed to Hensley Int climbing to 2000′ or, when directed by ATC, turn right, climb to 2000′, proceed to Lucas Int via ACF R-206.
*If Carter OM or 5 mi radar fix not received, descent below 1200′ MSL NA and ceiling minimum is 600′.
#Procedure turn nonstandard due ATC requirements.

City, Fort Worth; State, Tex.; Airport Name, Amon Carter; Elev., 568′; Fac. Class., VORTAC; Ident., ACF; Procedure No. TerVOR-13, Amdt. 2; Eff. Date, 2 Apr. 60; Sup. Amdt. No. 1; Dated, 20 June 59

5. The very high frequency omnirange-distance measuring equipment (VOR/DME) procedures prescribed in § 609.300 are amended to read in part:

VOR-DME STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURE

Bearings, headings, courses and radials are magnetic. Elevations and altitudes are in feet MSL. Ceilings are in feet above airport elevation. Distances are in nautical miles unless otherwise indicated, except visibilities which are in statute miles.

If an instrument approach procedure of the above type is conducted at the below named airport, it shall be in accordance with the following instrument approach procedure, unless an approach is conducted in accordance with a different procedure for such airport authorized by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. Initial approaches shall be made over specified routes. Minimum altitudes shall correspond with those established for en route operation in the particular area or as set forth below.

Transition				Ceiling and visibility minimums			
From—	To—	Course and distance	Minimum altitude (feet)	Condition	2-engine or less		More than 2-engine, more than 65 knots
					65 knots or less	More than 65 knots	
10 mi fix R-281	0 mi fix R-281	Direct	3000	T-dn	300-1	300-1	200-½
0 mi fix R-101	8.8 mi fix R-101	Direct	2500	C-dn	400-1	500-1	500-1½
8.8 mi fix R-101	9.5 mi fix R-101 (Final—airport)	Direct	2200	C-d#	800-1	800-1	800-1½
				C-n#	800-2	800-2	800-2
				A-dn	800-2	800-2	800-2

Procedure S side of crs, 281° Outbnd, 101° Inbnd, 3500′ within 10 mi. (Not required with DME.)
Minimum altitude over facility on final approach crs, 3000′.
If visual contact not established upon descent to authorized landing minimums or if landing not accomplished within 9.5 miles, climb to 3100 on R-101 within 20 miles.
NOTE: When authorized by ATC, DME may be used within 10 mi at 3800′ orbiting altitude to position aircraft for a final approach.
#Minimums without DME and procedure turn required.

City, Abilene; State, Tex.; Airport Name, Municipal; Elev., 1778′; Fac. Class., VOR-DME; Ident., ABI; Procedure No. VOR-DME-Airport, Amdt. 2; Eff. Date, 2 Apr. 60; Sup. Amdt. No. 1; Dated, 14 June 58

6. The instrument landing system procedures prescribed in § 609.400 are amended to read in part:

ILS STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURE

Bearings, headings, courses and radials are magnetic. Elevations and altitudes are in feet MSL. Ceilings are in feet above airport elevation. Distances are in nautical miles unless otherwise indicated, except visibilities which are in statute miles.

If an instrument approach procedure of the above type is conducted at the below named airport, it shall be in accordance with the following instrument approach procedure, unless an approach is conducted in accordance with a different procedure for such airport authorized by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. Initial approaches shall be made over specified routes. Minimum altitudes shall correspond with those established for en route operation in the particular area or as set forth below.

Transition				Ceiling and visibility minimums			
From—	To—	Course and distance	Minimum altitude (feet)	Condition	2-engine or less		More than 2-engine, more than 65 knots
					65 knots or less	More than 65 knots	
Int NE crs ILS and brng 254° to CRW LFR.	LOM	Direct	2500	T-dn	300-1	300-1	200-½
				C-dn	600-1	600-1	600-1½
CRW LFR	LOM	Direct	2500	S-dn-23	500-1	500-1	500-1
CRW VOR	LOM	Direct	2500	A-dn	800-2	800-2	800-2
Gay Int	LOM	Direct	2500				
Walnut Grove Int	LOM	Direct	2500				
Ivydale Int	LOM	Direct	2500				

Radar Terminal Area Transition Altitudes (Sectors are magnetic clockwise from Radar Site):
160°-210° within 10 miles, 3000′.
210°-160° within 10 miles, 2500′.
All sectors within 15 miles, 3000′.
All sectors within 23 miles, 5000′.
Procedure turn N side NE crs, 050° outbnd, 230° inbnd, 2300′ within 10 miles.
Minimum altitude at glide slope interception inbnd, 2300′.
Altitude of G.S. and distance to approach end of rny at LOM, 2330′—4.3; at LMM 1130′-0.5.
If visual contact not established upon descent to authorized landing minimums or if landing not accomplished climb to 3000′ proceeding to CRW LFR or, when directed by ATC, climb to 2500′ proceeding to CRW VOR.
NOTE: In the event the glide slope is inoperative, 500-1 minimums will still apply.

City, Charleston; State, W. Va.; Airport Name, Kanawha County; Elev., 981′; Fac. Class., ILS; Ident., CRW; Procedure No. ILS-23, Amdt. 11; Eff. Date, 2 Apr. 60; Sup. Amdt. No. 10; Dated, 15 Aug. 59

Charlotte LFR	LOM	Direct	2100	T-dn	300-1	300-1	200-½
Int N crs Charlotte LFR and SW crs ILS.	LOM	Direct	2200	C-dn	400-1	500-1	500-1½
				S-dn-5*	200-½	200-½	200-½
Ft. Mill VOR	Clover Int**	Direct	2300	A-dn	600-2	600-2	600-2
Clover Int**	LOM (Final)	Direct	2300				
Union Int	Clover Int**	Direct	2300				
York Int	Clover Int**	Direct	2200				
Bradley Int	LOM	Direct	2100				
Mt. Holly Int	LOM	Direct	2300				
Weddington Int	LOM	Direct	2100				
Waco Int	LOM	Direct	2900				
Bethany Int	LOM	Direct	2300				
Ft. Mill VOR	LOM	Direct	2300				
High Rock Int	LOM	Direct	2900				

Procedure turn N side of SW crs, 229° Outbnd, 049° Inbnd, 2300′ within 10 miles.
Minimum altitude at Glide Slope int inbnd, 2300′.
Altitude of G.S. and distance to appr end of rny at OM 2290′—4.6, at MM 950′—0.5.
If visual contact not established upon descent to authorized landing minimums or if landing not accomplished climb to 2200′ on NE crs ILS within 20 miles or, when directed by ATC, turn left, climb to 3000′ on FML-VOR R-006 to Mt. Holly Int or turn right, climb to 2100′ on R-006 to FML-VOR.
*400-¾ required when glide slope not utilized.
**Clover Int: Int R-328 FML-VOR and CLT-ILS SW crs. (To be shown on AL chart only.)

City, Charlotte; State, N.C.; Airport Name, Douglas; Elev., 748′; Fac. Class., ILS; Ident., I-CLT; Procedure No. ILS-5, Amdt. 13; Eff. Date, 2 Apr. 60; Sup. Amdt. No. 12 (ILS Portion of Comb. ILS-ADF); Dated, 22 Mar. 58

These procedures shall become effective on the dates indicated on the procedures.

(Secs. 313(a), 307(c), 72 Stat. 752, 749; 49 U.S.C. 1354(a), 1348(c))

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 3, 1960.

OSCAR BAKKE,
Director, Bureau of Flight Standards.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2180; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:45 a.m.]

Title 15—COMMERCE AND FOREIGN TRADE

Chapter II—National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce

PART 230 — STANDARD SAMPLES AND REFERENCE STANDARDS ISSUED BY THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Subpart B—Standard Samples and Reference Standards With Schedule of Weights and Fees

DESCRIPTIVE LIST

In accordance with the provisions of section 4 (a) and (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act, it has been found that notice and hearing on these schedules of fees are unnecessary for the reason that such procedures, because of the nature of these rules, serve no useful purpose. This amendment is effective from February 15, 1960.

1. Paragraph (m) *Spectrographic standards* (Titanium-Base) of § 230.11 is amended by the addition of standards 641, 642, 643, 644, 645 and 646 to read as follows:

(m) *Spectrographic standards.* * * *

(10) *Titanium-base samples.*

Sample [1] No.	Name [2]	Price per sample
641	Titanium alloy, 8 Mn (A)	$20
642	Titanium alloy, 8 Mn (B)	20
643	Titanium alloy, 8 Mn (C)	20
644	Titanium alloy, 2Cr—2Fe—2 Mo (A)	20
645	Titanium alloy, 2Cr—2Fe—2 Mo (B)	20
646	Titanium alloy, 2Cr—2Fe—2 Mo (C)	20

[1] Size: Disks, 1¼ inch in diameter and ¾ inch thick.
[2] 3 standards are available for each alloy, a high, a low, and a nominal composition standard.

(Sec. 9, 31 Stat. 1450, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 277. Interprets or applies sec. 7, 70 Stat. 959; 15 U.S.C. 275a)

R. D. HUNTOON,
Deputy Director,
National Bureau of Standards.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2268; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:49 a.m.]

Proposed Rule Making

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration

[21 CFR Part 120]

TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FROM TOLERANCES FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICALS IN OR ON RAW AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Notice of Filing of Petition

In re: Notice of filing of petition for establishment of tolerance for residues of ethoxyquin.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 408(d)(1), 68 Stat. 512; 21 U.S.C. 346a (d)(1)), the following notice is issued:

A petition has been filed by Monsanto Chemical Company, 800 North Lindbergh Boulevard, St. Louis 66, Missouri, proposing the establishment of a tolerance of 3 parts per million for residues of ethoxyquin (1,2-dihydro-6-ethoxy-2,2,4-trimethylquinoline) in or on the raw agricultural commodities apples and pears.

The analytical method proposed in the petition for determining residues of ethoxyquin is based on the determination of the fluorescence of an isooctane extract of the apples and pears. Fluorescence is determined by means of a photofluorometer set at zero with isooctane and 100 with quinine sulfate (5 micrograms per milliliter in 0.1 *N* hydrochloric acid).

Dated: March 4, 1960.

[SEAL] ROBERT S. ROE,
Director, Bureau of Biological and Physical Sciences.

[F.R. Doc 60-2258; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:48 a.m.]

[21 CFR Part 120]

TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FROM TOLERANCES FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICALS IN OR ON RAW AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Notice of Filing of Petition

In re: Notice of filing of petition for establishment of tolerances for residues of 1-naphthyl *N*-methylcarbamate.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (sec. 408(d)(1), 68 Stat. 512; 21 U.S.C. 346a (d)(1)), the following notice is issued:

A petition has been filed by Union Carbide Chemicals Company, 30 East 42d Street, New York 17, New York, proposing the establishment of tolerances for residues of 1-naphthyl *N*-methylcarbamate in or on raw agricultural commodities, as follows:

40 parts per million in or on corn fodder and forage.

5 parts per million in or on corn (kernels only and kernels plus cobs with husks removed).

The analytical method proposed in the petition for determining residues of 1-naphthyl *N*-methylcarbamate is that described in the FEDERAL REGISTER of January 9, 1959 (24 F.R. 238).

Dated: March 4, 1960.

[SEAL] ROBERT S. ROE,
Director, Bureau of Biological and Physical Sciences.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2259; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:48 a.m.]

[21 CFR Part 120]

TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FROM TOLERANCES FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICALS IN OR ON RAW AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Notice of Filing of Petition

In re: Notice of filing of petition for establishment of tolerance for residues of isopropyl *N*(3-chlorophenyl) carbamate.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 408(d)(1), 68 Stat. 512; 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(1)), the following notice is issued:

A petition has been filed by Columbia Southern Chemical Corporation, a subsidiary of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company, 1 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh 22, Pennsylvania, proposing the establishment of a tolerance of 50 parts per million for residues of isopropyl *N*(3-chlorophenyl) carbamate in or on potatoes, from postharvest application.

The analytical method proposed in the petition for determining residues of isopropyl *N*(3-chlorophenyl) carbamate is as follows: A methylene chloride extract made of macerated potatoes is evaporated to dryness, the residue is dissolved in carbon disulfide and infrared measurements are made at two wavelengths, 1,110 $cm.^{-1}$ and 1210 $cm.^{-1}$.

Dated: March 4, 1960.

[SEAL] ROBERT S. ROE,
Director, Bureau of Biological and Physical Sciences.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2260; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:48 a.m.]

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

[14 CFR Part 600]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-FW-79]

FEDERAL AIRWAYS

Modification

Pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (§ 409.13, 24 F.R. 3499), notice is hereby given that the Federal Aviation Agency is considering an amendment to §§ 600.6022 and 600.6157 of the regulations of the Administrator, the substance of which is stated below.

VOR Federal airway No. 22 extends, in part, from Marianna, Fla., to Jacksonville, Fla. VOR Federal airway No. 157 extends, in part, from Gainesville, Fla., to Alma, Ga. The Federal Aviation Agency has under consideration the redesignation of the Marianna-Jacksonville segment of Victor 22, including the north alternate, and the Gainesville-Alma segment of Victor 157. It is proposed to redesignate these airway segments via a VOR to be commissioned approximately May 15, 1960, and located near Taylor, Fla., at latitude 30°30'14" N., longitude 82°33'12" W. Victor 22 would be redesignated from Marianna to Jacksonville via the intersection of the Marianna VOR 141° and the Tallahassee VOR 267° True radials; Tallahassee, Fla., VOR; Taylor VOR; including a north alternate from Marianna to the Greenville, Fla., Intersection via the intersection of the Marianna VOR 093° and the Albany, Ga., VOR 152° True radials; and a north alternate from the Taylor VOR to the Jacksonville VOR via the intersection of the Taylor VOR 065° and the Jacksonville VOR 289° True radials. Victor 157 would be redesignated from Gainesville to Alma via the Taylor VOR direct station-to-station. These modifications would provide more precise navigational guidance on these airway segments. The segment of Victor 22 north alternate between Greenville and Taylor would be revoked since this is an unnecessary duplication of airways. The control areas associated with Victor 22 and Victor 157 are so designated that they would automatically conform to the modified airways. Accordingly, no amendment relating to such control areas would be necessary.

If this action is taken, the segment of VOR Federal airway No. 22 would be redesignated from Marianna, Fla., to Jacksonville, Fla., via the intersection of the Marianna VOR 141° and the Tallahassee VOR 267° True radials; Tallahassee, Fla., VOR; Taylor, Fla., VOR; including a north alternate from Marianna to the Greenville, Fla., Intersection via the intersection of the Marianna VOR 093° and the Albany, Ga., VOR 152° True radials; and a north alternate from the Taylor VOR to the Jacksonville VOR via the intersection of the Taylor VOR 065° and the Jacksonville VOR 289° True radials to Jacksonville. VOR Federal airway No. 157 would be redesignated from Gainesville, Fla., to Alma, Ga., via Taylor, Fla.

Interested persons may submit such written data, views or arguments as they may desire. Communications should be submitted in triplicate to the Chief, Air

Traffic Management Division, Federal Aviation Agency, P.O. Box 1689, Fort Worth 1, Tex. All communications received within forty-five days after publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER will be considered before action is taken on the proposed amendment. No public hearing is contemplated at this time, but arrangements for informal conferences with Federal Aviation Agency officials may be made by contacting the Regional Air Traffic Management Division Chief, or the Chief, Airspace Utilization Division, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington 25, D.C. Any data, views or arguments presented during such conferences must also be submitted in writing in accordance with this notice in order to become part of the record for consideration. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in the light of comments received.

The official Docket will be available for examination by interested persons at the Docket Section, Federal Aviation Agency, Room B-316, 1711 New York Avenue NW., Washington 25, D.C. An informal Docket will also be available for examination at the office of the Regional Air Traffic Management Division Chief.

This amendment is proposed under sections 307(a) and 313(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 7, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2234; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:45 a.m.]

[14 CFR Parts 600, 601]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-WA-106]

FEDERAL AIRWAYS AND CONTROL AREAS

Notice of Withdrawal of Proposed Rule Making

In a Notice of Proposed Rule Making published in the FEDERAL REGISTER as Airspace Docket No. 59-WA-106 on December 30, 1959 (24 F.R. 10985), it was proposed to modify VOR Federal airway No. 167 and its associated control areas by extending Victor 167 southward from New York, N.Y., to Cape Charles, Va., via the Coyle, N.J., VOR; Atlantic City, N.J., VOR; and a VOR to be installed aproximately April 15, 1960, near Roxana, Del., at latitude 38°28'48" N., longitude 75°11'58" W.; thence via a VOR to be installed approximately April 15, 1960, near Accomac, Va., at latitude 37°49'56" N., longitude 75°35'22" W., thence to the Cape Charles, Va., VOR. Since the date of publication of this proposal in the FEDERAL REGISTER, a revised proposal for the designation of a VOR Federal airway along the Eastern seaboard between Cape Charles, Va., and New York, N.Y., via other VOR navigation facilities which would be substituted for the VOR's proposed at Roxana, Del., and Accomac, Va., has been developed for publication as a subsequent Airspace Docket.

In consideration of the foregoing, the Notice of Proposed Rule Making contained in Airspace Docket No. 59-WA-106 is hereby withdrawn.

(Secs. 307(a), 313(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354))

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 7, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2235; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:45 a.m.]

[14 CFR Parts 600, 601]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-FW-27]

FEDERAL AIRWAYS, CONTROL AREAS AND REPORTING POINTS

Modification of Federal Airways, Associated Control Areas and Control Area Extension; Revocation and Designation of Reporting Points

Pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (§ 409.13, 24 F.R. 3499), notice is hereby given that the Federal Aviation Agency is considering an amendment to §§ 600.6001, 600.6213, 601.6213, 601.1175 and 600.7001 of the regulations of the Administrator, the substance of which is stated below.

VOR Federal airway No. 1 extends, in part, from Charleston, S.C., via Myrtle Beach, S.C., to Wilmington, N.C. VOR Federal airway No. 213 extends in part from Myrtle Beach, S.C., via the intersection of the Myrtle Beach 033° and the Rocky Mount VOR 191° True radials to Rocky Mount, N.C. The Federal Aviation Agency has under consideration minor modifications to Victor 1 and 213 and the Charleston, S.C., control area extension.

The Myrtle Beach VOR is being relocated approximately June 15, 1960, to Crescent Beach, S.C., at latitude 33°48'47" N., longitude 78°43'13" W. This relocation is necessary because of the transfer of civil aviation activities from Myrtle Beach Airport to Crescent Beach Airport on or about March 1, 1960, and the requirement for an approach aid to serve the Crescent Beach Airport. It is proposed to redesignate Victor 1 from Charleston to Wilmington, via the relocated Crescent Beach VOR and to redesignate Victor 213 from the Crescent Beach VOR to Rocky Mount, N.C., VOR, via the intersection of the Crescent Beach 030° and the Rocky Mount 191° True radials. The control areas associated with Victor 1 are so designated that they would automatically conform to the modified airway and therefore no amendment relating to such control areas would be necessary. Concurrently with this action it is proposed to redescribe the Charleston control area extension by substituting VOR Federal airway No. 1 for Amber Federal airway No. 9 and the Crescent Beach VOR 220° True radial for the Myrtle Beach 218° True radial in describing the northeast portion of the Charleston control area extension. It is also proposed to revoke Emerson, N.C., intersection (the intersection of the Myrtle Beach VOR 083° and the Wilmington VOR 281° True radials) as a Domestic VOR reporting point and to designate Bolton, N.C., intersection (the intersection of the Crescent Beach VOR 030° and the Wilmington 263° True radials), as a Domestic VOR reporting point.

If these actions are taken, VOR Federal airway No. 1 would be redesignated in part from Charleston, S.C., to Wilmington, N.C., via the Crescent Beach, S.C., VOR; Victor 213 and its associated control areas would be redesignated in part from Crescent Beach, S.C., via the Crescent Beach VOR 030° and the Rocky Mount 191° True radials to Rocky Mount, N.C. The Emerson, N.C., intersection would be revoked as a Domestic VOR reporting point; and the Bolton, N.C., intersection would be designated as a Domestic VOR reporting point. The Charleston, S.C., control area extension would be redescribed as the airspace south of Charleston bounded on the north by VOR Federal airway No. 53 and the Charleston control area extension (601.1152), on the southeast by a line 3 nautical miles southeast of and parallel to the shoreline, on the south by the Savannah control area extension 601.1008, and on the west by VOR Federal airway No. 3; the airspace northeast of Charleston bounded on the west by VOR Federal airway No. 1, on the north by the Myrtle Beach control area extension (601.1369), on the east by a line 5 miles east of and parallel to the Crescent Beach VOR 220° True radial, and on the south by the Charleston control area extension (601.1152).

Interested persons may submit such written data, views or arguments as they may desire. Communications should be submitted in triplicate to the Chief, Air Traffic Management Division, Federal Aviation Agency, P.O. Box 1689, Fort Worth 1, Tex. All communications received within forty-five days after publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER will be considered before action is taken on the proposed amendment. No public hearing is contemplated at this time, but arrangements for informal conferences with Federal Aviation Agency officials may be made by contacting the Regional Air Traffic Management Division Chief, or the Chief, Airspace Utilization Division, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington 25, D.C. Any data, views or arguments presented during such conferences must also be submitted in writing in accordance with this notice in order to become part of the record for consideration. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in the light of comments received.

The official Docket will be available for examination by interested persons at the Docket Section, Federal Aviation Agency, Room B-316, 1711 New York Avenue NW., Washington 25, D.C. An informal Docket will also be available for examination at the office of the Regional Air Traffic Management Division Chief.

This amendment is proposed under sections 307(a) and 313(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 7, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2237; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:45 a.m.]

[14 CFR Part 601]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-NY-64]

CONTROL ZONE

Designation

Pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (§ 409.13, 24 F.R. 3499), notice is hereby given that the Federal Aviation Agency is considering an amendment to § 601.1984 of the regulations of the Administrator, the substance of which is stated below.

The Federal Aviation Agency has under consideration the designation of a control zone at Trenton, N.J., within a 5-mile radius of the Mercer County Airport, excluding the portion which would coincide with the Philadelphia, Pa., control zone. The designation of this control zone would provide protection for aircraft conducting IFR approaches and departures at the Mercer County Airport.

If this action is taken, the Trenton, N.J., control zone would be designated within a 5-mile radius of the Mercer County Airport (latitude 40°16'33" N., longitude 74°48'55" W.), excluding the portion which overlaps the Philadelphia, Pa., control zone.

Interested persons may submit such written data, views or arguments as they may desire. Communications should be submitted in triplicate to the Chief, Air Traffic Management Division, Federal Aviation Agency, Federal Building, New York International Airport, Jamaica 30, N.Y. All communications received within forty-five days after publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER will be considered before action is taken on the proposed amendment. No public hearing is contemplated at this time, but arrangements for informal conferences with Federal Aviation Agency officials may be made by contacting the Regional Air Traffic Management Division Chief, or the Chief, Airspace Utilization Division, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington 25, D.C. Any data, views or arguments presented during such conferences must also be submitted in writing in accordance with this notice in order to become part of the record for consideration. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in the light of comments received.

The official Docket will be available for examination by interested persons at the Docket Section, Federal Aviation Agency, Room B-316, 1711 New York Avenue NW., Washington 25, D.C. An informal Docket will also be available for examination at the office of the Regional Air Traffic Management Division Chief.

This amendment is proposed under sections 307(a) and 313(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354).

Issued in Washington, D.C. on March 7, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2236; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:45 a.m.]

[14 CFR Part 602]

[Airspace Docket No. 60-WA-17]

CODED JET ROUTES

Revocation

Pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (§ 409.13, 24 F.R. 3499), notice is hereby given that the Federal Aviation Agency is considering an amendment to Part 602 of the regulations of the Administrator, the substance of which is stated below.

VOR/VORTAC jet route No. 14 presently extends from Oakland, Calif., to New York, N.Y. The Federal Aviation Agency has under consideration the revocation of this jet route. The Oakland to Wolback, Nebr., segment of Jet Route 14-V will be duplicated by VOR/VORTAC jet route No. 84 which is to be designated from Oakland, Calif., to United States/Canadian border via Wolback, Nebr., Airspace Docket No. 59-WA-135, effective March 10, 1960. Traffic using Jet Route 14-V from Wolback, to New York would be adequately served by VOR/VORTAC jet route No. 60 which is designated from Los Angeles, Calif., to New York, N.Y., via Wolback, Nebr. Therefore, Jet Route 14-V appears to be an unnecessary duplication of jet routes and the revocation thereof would facilitate flight planning and air traffic management by simplifying the route structure between these terminals.

If this action is taken, VOR/VORTAC jet route No. 14 from Oakland, Calif., to New York, N.Y., would be revoked.

Interested persons may submit such written data, views or arguments as they may desire. Communications should be submitted in triplicate to the Chief, Airspace Utilization Division, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington 25, D.C. All communications received within forty-five days after publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER will be considered before action is taken on the proposed amendment. No public hearing is contemplated at this time, but arrangements for informal conferences with Federal Aviation Agency officials may be made by contacting the Chief, Airspace Utilization Division. Any data, views or arguments presented during such conferences must also be submitted in writing in accordance with this notice in order to become part of the record for consideration. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in the light of comments received.

The official Docket will be available for examination by interested persons at the Docket Section, Federal Aviation Agency, Room B-316, 1711 New York Avenue NW., Washington 25, D.C.

This amendment is proposed under sections 307(a) and 313(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 7, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2238; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:46 a.m.]

[14 CFR Part 608]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-NY-17]

RESTRICTED AREAS

Withdrawal of Proposal To Establish a Restricted Area/Military Climb Corridor

In a Notice of Proposed Rule Making published in the FEDERAL REGISTER as Airspace Docket No. 59-NY-17 on November 11, 1959 (24 F.R. 9210), it was proposed to designate a Restricted Area/Military Climb Corridor at Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass. The Federal Aviation Agency has been advised by the Department of Air Force that there is no longer a requirement for a Restricted Area/Military Climb Corridor at Westover Air Force Base.

In consideration of the foregoing, the Notice of Proposed Rule Making contained in Airspace Docket No. 59-NY-17 is hereby withdrawn.

Sections 307(a) and 313(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 7, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2239; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:46 a.m.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

[7 CFR Part 904]

MILK IN GREATER BOSTON, MASS., MARKETING AREA

Notice of Proposed Suspension of Certain Provision(s) of the Order

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), the suspension of certain provision(s) of the order regulating the handling of milk in the Greater Boston, Massachusetts, marketing area is being considered.

The provisions proposed to be suspended are "any of" as they first appear in the § 904.2(d)(3) immediately preceding the words "the preceding months of July through March" and as they first appear in § 904.21(f) relating to the "Dairy farmer for other markets" definition and the pooling provisions.

The five New England regulated markets draw milk from a generally common supply area and class prices in these markets are established under identical pricing mechanisms and, except for a seven-cent higher Class I price in Southeastern New England, at the same level.

It was expected that with the advent of regulation in Southeastern New England and Connecticut in 1959 shifts of supply plants out of the Boston market to the newly regulated markets would result in close alignment of blend prices at competitive points. The anticipated price alignment was obtained in the month of October when the Southeastern New England blended price was only four cents over the Boston blended price. During the period November 1959 through January 1960, however, the Southeastern New England price has averaged about 16 cents below Boston and, as a result, handlers have shifted plants from the Southeastern market to the Boston market. It is expected that the two prices will therefore again be closely aligned by the month of March. However, because of the flush season exclusion in the pooling provisions of the Boston order, four plants presently regulated under Boston must return to the Southeastern pool for the months of April, May and June which will result in a substantial difference in blended prices in favor of Boston.

A considerable number of the 105 issues considered at the five-market general amendment hearing held in New England on September 9 to October 8, 1959, was specifically directed to the pooling problem and the preponderance of evidence was in favor of providing greater freedom for movement of plants and milk as between markets to implement the equation of blended price and promote more orderly marketing. Because of the number of issues involved it has not been possible to issue a full decision on the matters considered at this hearing and because of the general interrelationship of the many proposals it has not been practical to separate issues to handle the pooling problem. Nevertheless, it is apparent that the structure of the several orders should not restrict the movement of plants as between markets to the extent of precluding the possibility of alignment of blended price as between markets during the forthcoming months of April through June.

The proposed suspension will not, in and of itself, change the status of any presently regulated plant. It will, however, provide opportunity for handlers during April, May and June to maintain pooling status under the Boston order for certain plants which during somemonths of the July 1959–March 1960 period were under the Boston order and in other months under the Southeastern New England order. While the suspension could provide pooling status for certain plants which were regulated only under the Boston order and only for part of the July 1959–March 1960 period the number and size of such plants would be such as to have an insignificant effect on the total pool.

The suspension in the "dairy farmer for other markets" definition is a corollary action with the suspension in the pooling provision and is necessary to assure producer status for the dairy farmers who regularly delivered to any plants which might elect pooling under the Boston order as a result of this suspension. Without this corollary suspension the plants would be deterred from shifting because of the loss of producer status for its regular producers.

All persons who desire to submit written data, views, or arguments in connection with the proposed suspension should file the same with the Hearing Clerk, Room 112, Administration Building, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D.C., not later than 8 days from the date of publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER. All documents filed should be in quadruplicate.

Issued at Washington, D.C., this 7th day of March 1960.

ROY W. LENNARTSON,
Deputy Administrator,
Agricultural Marketing Service.

[F.R. Doc. 60–2250; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:47 a.m.]

Notices

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Bureau of Customs

[643.3]

SHOEBOARD FROM FRANCE

Notice That There Is Reason To Believe or Suspect Purchase Price Is Less or Likely To Be Less Than Foreign Market Value

MARCH 7, 1960.

Pursuant to section 201(b) of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended (19 U.S.C. 160(b)), notice is hereby given that there is reason to believe or suspect, from information presented to me, that the purchase price of shoeboard imported from France is less or likely to be less than the foreign market value, as defined by sections 203 and 205, respectively, of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended (19 U.S.C. 162 and 164).

Customs officers are being authorized to withhold appraisement of entries of shoeboard from France pursuant to § 14.9 of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR 14.9).

[SEAL] D. B. STRUBINGER,
Acting Commissioner of Customs.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2264; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:49 a.m.]

Foreign Assets Control

CUT JADE STONES

Available Certificates by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany

Certificates of origin issued under procedures agreed upon between the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Foreign Assets Control are now available with respect to the importation into the United States directly, or on a through bill of lading, from Germany of the following commodity: Jade stones, cut.

Certificates will be countersigned by a Customs official of the Ministry of Finance of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on a form provided by the Chamber of Industry and Commerce of Koblenz (Aussenstelle Idar-Oberstein) and will also be signed by an official of the Chamber. Attention is directed to the fact that no such Certificate is acceptable for Foreign Assets Control purposes unless it bears the counter-signature of the German Customs.

[SEAL] ELTING ARNOLD,
Acting Director,
Foreign Assets Control.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2322; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 9:01 a.m.]

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

[Docket No. SA-352]

ACCIDENT OCCURRING AT BOLIVIA, N.C.

Notice of Hearing

In the matter of investigation of accident involving aircraft of United States Registry N 8225H, which occurred January 6, 1960, at Bolivia, North Carolina.

Notice is hereby given that an Accident Investigation Hearing on the above styled matter will be held commencing March 22, 1960, at 10:00 a.m. (local time) in the Ball Room of the Cape Fear Hotel, Wilmington, North Carolina.

Dated this 4th day of March 1960.

[SEAL] JOHN L. MCWHORTER,
Hearing Officer.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2262; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:48 a.m.]

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[Docket No. 6517; FCC 60-200]

WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH CO. AND POSTAL TELEGRAPH, INC.

Application for Merger; Order Designating Matter for Hearing on Stated Issues

At a session of the Federal Communications Commission held at its offices in Washington, D.C., on the 2d day of March 1960;

The Commission having under consideration:

(a) A Petition filed jointly on February 1, 1960, by The Western Union Telegraph Company (Western Union), and Barnes Investing Corporation (Barnes), wherein it was requested that the Commission make such findings as are required by the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, (Act), including subsection 222(c)(2) under which Western Union is required to divest its international telegraph operations, and enter such order or orders as may be required by law so that there may be consummation of an Agreement (annexed to the Petition) between Western Union and Barnes for the sale of the Western Union international telegraph operations to Barnes;

(b) The aforementioned Agreement between Western Union and Barnes, entered into on January 25, 1960, and filed with the Commission January 28, 1960, to comply with the Memorandum Opinion and Order released August 3, 1959, in Docket No. 10151, Divestment of Western Union;

(c) The comments with respect to the aforementioned Petition and Agreement, submitted in response to the Commission's letter of February 4, 1960, addressed to all entities named in List A attached hereto, by the Department of State (in a letter dated February 12, 1960), by the Department of Justice (in a letter dated February 15, 1960), by American Cable & Radio Corporation (in a letter dated February 12, 1960), by RCA Communications, Inc., (in a letter dated February 15, 1960), and by American Communications Association (in a letter dated February 11, 1960);

(d) The Commission's Report and Order herein dated September 27, 1943, (10 FCC 148) wherein the merger of Western Union and Postal Telegraph, Inc. was approved, and wherein jurisdiction was retained over the matter of divestment by Western Union of its international telegraph operations for the purpose of any action which may appear necessary and appropriate in order to effectuate the requirements of such subsection 222(c)(2) of the Act;

(e) The Commission's Final Decision, released July 10, 1958, in the aforementioned Docket No. 10151;

(f) The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on petition of Western Union to set aside the order in the above Final Decision, remanding the matter to the Commission for action not inconsistent with such opinion, Western Union v. United States, 267 F. 2d 715 (1959);

(g) The Commission's aforementioned Memorandum Opinion and Order in Docket No. 10151, as amended by order of December 2, 1959, requiring Western Union to submit a plan for divestment of its international telegraph operations by February 1, 1960; and

(h) The Formula, Pursuant to section 222(e)(1) of the Act, for the Distribution of Outbound International Traffic Handled by The Western Union Telegraph Company following Merger with Postal Telegraph, Inc. (Formula);

It appearing that upon review of the aforementioned Petition, Agreement, and comments, certain basic issues are raised which should be resolved on the basis of a formal hearing record;

It further appearing that since subsection 222(c)(2) of the Act requires, among other things, that any proposed consolidation or merger of domestic telegraph carriers shall provide for the divestment of the international telegraph operations theretofore carried on by any party to the consolidation or merger, and since as noted hereinabove, we retained jurisdiction over the matter of such divestment in our Order in Docket No. 6517 approving consolidation or merger of Western Union and Postal Telegraph, Inc., the proceedings herein are a continuation of formal proceedings in that Docket, and that, therefore,

insofar as the proceedings herein may have adjudicatory aspects, the procedural requirements of the Communications Act Amendments, 1952, and the Administrative Procedure Act are not mandatory;

It further appearing that in view of the delays which have occurred between the time that divestment was first required and the time the Agreement herein was filed, the desirability of reaching a decision on the Petition as quickly as possible, the time schedules set forth in the Agreement, and the negotiations of an international scope involved, due and timely execution of this Commission's functions imperatively and unavoidably require that this matter be decided by the Commission without the issuance of an Initial, Recommended, or Tentative Decision; *Provided, however,* That our reference herein to time schedules in the Agreement shall not constitute a finding that they are reasonable or that in agreeing to them Western Union fully discharged its obligation to exercise due diligence;

It is ordered, That, pursuant to sections 4, 212, 214, and 222 of the Act, the Commission shall enter into a hearing and investigation to determine whether the proposed plan for divestment is in conformity with applicable law and whether the Commission should in the public interest grant the joint Petition hereinabove described, and in that connection, without limiting the scope of the issues raised thereby, such hearing shall encompass the following issues:

(1) Is the furnishing of the services of an officer of Western Union to serve as Chairman of the Advisory Committee of the divestee or its successor for a 10-year period consistent with the divestment requirement, and in this connection, whether the holding of such office by such individual will adversely affect public or private interest;

(2) Is the provision by Western Union of certain research and development, engineering, auditing, and other technical services for a period of 10 years consistent with the divestment requirement;

(3) Is the leasing or subleasing of facilities and quarters from Western Union, so that close physical contact between Western Union and the divestee is maintained, consistent with the divestment requirement;

(4) Will any of the exact terms and conditions of each other agreement which Western Union and the new corporation, or its successor, are obligated to execute pursuant to the Agreement be inconsistent with the divestment requirement;

(5) Is the right to use the corporate name "Western Union Cables Corporation," and the trade names "Western Union Cables," "WU Cables," and similar names, consistent with the divestment requirement;

(6) What is the exact identity of the entity which will acquire, own, and operate the cable system after divestment, and, if a corporation, the identity and citizenship of each person who will own, control, or vote, directly or indirectly, any shares of the capital stock of such corporation;

(7) What are the legal, technical, and financial qualifications of the entity which will own and operate the divested cable system;

(8) What will be the actual financial and corporate structure of Western Union Cables Corporation, referred to in the Agreement, as well as of the entity, if any, which will be the ultimate owner and operator of the cable system after divestment, and the intercorporate relationships between the entities which may be created to acquire, own, control, or operate the physical facilities now used in the conduct of Western Union's international telegraph operations, and the means to be used by Barnes, or the entity on whose behalf Barnes is acting, to raise the funds,

(i) To acquire the cable system;

(ii) To acquire the Anglo-American Telegraph Company, Ltd. (Anglo);

(iii) To supply both the cash working capital and the capital necessary for the mechanization and modernization each referred to in section 3.2 of the Agreement; and

(iv) To supply any other funds used to conduct operations in the public interest;

(9) What are the plans of the entities which will own, control, or operate the cable system for such operations;

(10) What will be the relationship between the entity controlling Anglo and the entity controlling the divested Western Union international telegraph operations and in this connection, what modification will be made in the Anglo lease;

(11) Is the consideration for the property to be divested commensurate with its value, and in this connection,

(i) The exact consideration to be given;

(ii) The exact property to be divested;

(iii) The extent to which any international telegraph property cannot be divested without consent or approval of other parties and the effect that any failure to transfer such property would have upon the operation of the cable system;

(12) Are the provisions in the Agreement providing for changes in the Formula consistent with the Commission's Order for the submission of a divestment plan;

(13) If so, what changes in the Formula are necessary to implement the Agreement, and will they result in a Formula which is just, reasonable, equitable, and in the public interest, and will each such change be, so far as consistent with the public interest, in accordance with the existing contractual rights of the parties to the Formula;

(14) What are the exact plans and proposals of the entities which will own, control, or operate the cable system with respect to the persons presently employed in conducting the international telegraph operations of Western Union, including such matters as job security, and pension equities, as well as the continuity and funding of pension equities;

(15) What are the orders, authorizations, certificates, or other instruments which are necessary to effectuate divestment, and to what entities should such orders be addressed or such authorizations or certificates or other instruments be granted;

(16) Is it appropriate to require in the Agreement that Commission action take place before all of the other consents and approvals set forth in the Agreement are secured, and in this connection, what progress has been made in securing such other consents and approvals; and

(17) Does the Agreement between Western Union and Barnes otherwise set forth a plan of the type Western Union was required to submit by the Commission's Order of August 3, 1959, referred to hereinabove;

It is further ordered, That, in addition to the Petitioners, each of the entities named in List A, below, may participate in these proceedings by filing a notice of intention to do so within 10 days after the release of this Order, and, in connection with such notice, each such entity which intends to participate shall state the issues with respect to which it intends to make an affirmative presentation, the name of the witness or witnesses to be presented with respect to each such issue, and the nature of the exhibits to be offered with respect to each such issue;

It is further ordered, That, this matter is designated for hearing at a time and place to be specified in a separate order, and that the Presiding officer shall, without preparing either an initial or recommended decision, certify the record to the Commission for final decision;

It is further ordered, That, proposed findings and conclusions, briefs, or memoranda of law shall be filed within twenty days after the close of the record herein, and that oral argument thereon shall be held at a time and place to be fixed by the Commission.

Released: March 3, 1960.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
[SEAL] MARY JANE MORRIS,
Secretary.

List A

The Honorable the Secretary of State, Washington 25, D.C.

The Honorable the Attorney General, Washington 25, D.C.

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington 25, D.C.

The Honorable the Secretary of the Army, Washington 25, D.C.

The Honorable the Secretary of the Navy, Washington 25, D.C.

The Honorable the Governor of Florida.

The Honorable the Governor of Massachusetts.

The Honorable the Governor of New York.

National Association of Railroad & Utilities Commissioners, Interstate Commerce Building, Washington 25, D.C.

American Cable & Radio Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York 4, N.Y.

American Communications Association, 66 Leonard Street, New York 4, N.Y.

American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York 7, N.Y.

Canadian National Telegraphs, 374 Bay Street, Toronto 1, Ontario, Canada.

Canadian Pacific Railway Co., Martin A. Meyer, Jr., Esq., 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Commercial Telegraphers Union, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md., Attn: W. L. Allen, International President.

Communication Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., Attn: Jos. A. Beirne, President.

The French Telegraph Cable Co., 25 Broad Street, New York 4, N.Y.

Globe Wireless Ltd., 141 Battery Street, San Francisco 11, Calif.

Press Wireless, Inc., 660 First Avenue, New York 16, N.Y.

RCA Communications, Inc., 66 Broad Street, New York 4, N.Y.

Tropical Radio Telegraph Co., 80 Federal Street, Boston 10, Mass.

United States-Liberia Radio Corp., 1200 Firestone Parkway, Akron 17, Ohio.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2266; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:49 a.m.]

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

[Docket No. E-6929]

PUGET SOUND POWER & LIGHT CO.

Application

MARCH 4, 1960.

Take notice that on February 29, 1960, an application was filed with the Federal Power Commission pursuant to section 204 of the Federal Power Act by Puget Sound Power & Light Company ("Applicant"), a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Massachusetts and doing business in the State of Washington, with its principal business office at Seattle, Washington, seeking an order authorizing the issuance of $20,000,000, principal amount of First Mortgage Bonds, ------ percent Series due 1990. The First Mortgage Bonds are to be issued under Applicant's First Mortgage dated as of June 2, 1924, as heretofore supplemented and modified and as to be further supplemented by the Forty-fifth Supplemental Indenture to be dated as of April 1, 1960. The aforesaid First Mortgage Bonds are to be dated April 1, 1960, and to mature April 1, 1990. Said Bonds are to be sold at competitive bidding with the interest rate and price to be supplied by a subsequent amendment to Applicant's application. Applicant states that the proceeds from the issuance and sale of the First Mortgage Bonds will be applied to the payment of its $15,000,000 Promissory Note in favor of Metropolitan Life Insurance Company issued May 1, 1950, and due May 1, 1960, and the balance, to the extent permitted, to the payment of outstanding bank loans.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before the 24th day of March, 1960, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington 25, D.C., petitions or protests in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10). The application is on file and available for public inspection.

MICHAEL J. FARRELL,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2240; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:46 a.m.]

[Docket No. G-18078 etc.]

TEXACO, INC., ET AL.

Severance

MARCH 4, 1960.

Texaco, Inc., et al., Docket No. G-18078, etc.; Tennessee Gas Transmission Company, Docket No. G-18765; South Texas Natural Gas Gathering Company, Docket No. G-18907; Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation, Docket No. G-18920; Tennessee Gas Transmission Company, et al., Docket No. G-19084; Texaco, Inc., Docket No. G-19787; W. H. Hunt, Docket No. G-19956.

Upon consideration of the motions filed on behalf of Texaco, Inc. on February 29, 1960, and W. H. Hunt on March 1, 1960, for the withdrawal of Docket Nos. G-19787 and G-19956, respectively, from the hearing now scheduled for March 7, 1960 in the above-designated matters:

Notice is hereby given that the abovementioned dockets are hereby severed therefrom.

MICHAEL J. FARRELL,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2241; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:46 a.m.]

[Docket No. G-18078 etc.]

TEXACO, INC., ET AL.

Severance

MARCH 4, 1960.

Texaco Inc., et al., Docket Nos. G-18078, etc; Tennessee Gas Transmission Company, Docket No. G-18765; South Texas Natural Gas Gathering Company, Docket No. G-18907; Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation, Docket No. G-18920; Tennessee Gas Transmission Company, et al., Docket No. G-19084; Claud B. Hamill, Docket No. G-18611.

Upon consideration of the motion filed on March 2, 1960, by Claud B. Hamill for the severance of Docket No. G-18611 from the hearing now scheduled for March 7, 1960, in the above-designated matters:

Notice is hereby given that the abovementioned Docket is hereby severed therefrom.

MICHAEL J. FARRELL,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2242; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:46 a.m.]

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Public Housing Administration

DELEGATIONS OF FINAL AUTHORITY

Section II, Delegations of Final Authority, is amended as follows:

Effective November 18, 1959, paragraph D9 is amended by adding to the list of places shown therein:

Bremerton, Washington.
San Diego, California.

Approved: March 3, 1960.

[SEAL] LAWRENCE DAVERN,
Acting Commissioner.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2245; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:46 a.m.]

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[File No. 70-3863]

NEW ENGLAND ELECTRIC SYSTEM ET AL.

Notice of Filing Regarding Issue and Sale of Promissory Notes by Subsidiaries to Banks and to Parent Company

MARCH 3, 1960.

Notice is hereby given that a joint application-declaration has been filed with this Commission pursuant to the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 ("Act") by New England Electric System ("NEES"), a registered holding company, and certain of its public-utility subsidiaries ("the borrowing companies"), namely, Attleboro Electric Company ("Attleboro"), Central Massachusetts Gas Company ("Central Mass."), Granite State Electric Company ("Granite"), Lawrence Gas Company ("Lawrence"), Lynn Electric Company ("Lynn Electric"), Lynn Gas Company ("Lynn Gas"), Merrimack-Essex Electric Company ("Merrimack"), The Mystic Power Company ("Mystic"), Mystic Valley Gas Company ("Mystic Valley"), Northampton Electric Lighting Company ("Northampton"), Northampton Gas Light Company ("Northampton Gas"), North Shore Gas Company ("North Shore"), Northern Berkshire Electric Company ("Northern"), Norwood Gas Company ("Norwood"), Quincy Electric Company ("Quincy"), Southern Berkshire Power & Electric Company ("Southern"), Suburban Electric Company ("Suburban"), Wachusett Gas Company ("Wachusett"), Weymouth Light and Power Company ("Weymouth"), and Worcester County Electric Company ("Worcester"). NEES and the borrowing companies have designated sections 6(a), 7, 10, and 12(f) of the Act and Rules 42(b)(2), 43, 50(a)(2) and 50(a)(3) thereunder as applicable to the proposed transactions, which are summarized as follows:

The borrowing companies propose to issue, from time to time through December 31, 1960, unsecured promissory notes to banks and/or NEES in the maximum aggregate amount of $44,105,000 to be outstanding at any one time. The proceeds of the proposed borrowings are to be used to pay then outstanding notes due to banks and/or to NEES (outstanding in the principal amount of $29,085,000 at January 1, 1960), to make sinking fund conversion loan payments aggregating $558,000, and to provide new money (estimated at $14,462,000 for the year ending December 31, 1960) for construction expenditures or to reimburse the treasury therefor. The proposed notes will bear interest at not in excess of the prime rate in effect at the time of issuance, will mature on or prior to March 31, 1961, and will be prepayable at any time, in whole or in part, without premium.

With respect to the proposed notes, provision will be made for certain subsidiaries to prepay their notes to banks,

in whole or in part, with borrowings from NEES, or vice versa. Any notes issued to NEES for such prepayment of notes to banks, will bear interest at the prime rate, but not in excess of the interest rate on the notes being prepaid, to the date of their maturity. In the case of notes issued to banks for such prepayment of notes to NEES, if the interest rate exceeds that of the notes to be prepaid, NEES proposes to credit the borrowing company with the difference between the interest rate on the new note to be issued to the bank and the interest rate on the note to be prepaid, for the period from the date of the issuance of such new note to the normal maturity date of the note payable to NEES which is to be prepaid.

Each of the borrowing companies proposes that if any permanent financing is done prior to the maturity of the indebtedness to be issued hereunder, the proceeds therefrom, not used to refund other securities, will be applied in reduction of, or in total payment of, its note indebtedness then outstanding; that the balance of its note indebtedness then unissued hereunder, if any, will be reduced by the amount, if any, by which such proceeds exceed its note indebtedness at the time outstanding; and that the maximum amount of its note indebtedness proposed to be outstanding hereunder will be reduced by the amount of such proceeds.

The following table shows for each borrowing company the estimated maximum amount of notes issued hereunder to be outstanding with banks and with NEES at any one time.

Borrowing company	Estimated maximum amount of notes to be outstanding (in thousands)		
	Banks	NEES	Banks or NEES
Attleboro		$1,450	
Central Mass	$1,100		
Granite	1,650		
Lawrence	1,300		
Lynn Electric	2,720		
Merrimack	9,325		$4,250
Suburban	3,000		
Lynn Gas	730		
Mystic	450		
Mystic Valley	4,050		
North Shore	1,650		
Northampton		1,010	
Northampton Gas		865	
Northern			1,610
Norwood		1,065	
Quincy		600	
Weymouth		1,400	
Southern		1,980	
Wachusett	1,100		
Worcester			2,800
Totals	27,075	8,370	8,660

The proposed bank borrowings will be made from the following banks in the aggregate maximum amounts indicated:

The First National City Bank of New York	$7,900,000
The First National Bank of Boston	[1] 25,185,000
Naumkeag Trust Company, Salem, Massachusetts	150,000
Merchants-Warren National Bank, Salem, Massachusetts	100,000
Industrial National Bank of Providence	450,000
First National Bank of Malden	$150,000
Malden Trust Company	100,000
Middlesex County National Bank, Everett, Massachusetts	250,000
Worcester County National Bank, Worcester, Massachusetts	[2] 750,000
Guaranty Bank & Trust Company, Worcester, Massachusetts	[2] 400,000
The Mechanics National Bank of Worcester	[2] 300,000
Total	35,735,000

[1] Includes $7,210,000 to be borrowed from the bank or from NEES.

[2] To be borrowed from the bank or from NEES.

Incidental services in connection with the proposed note issues will be performed, at cost, by New England Power Service Company, an affiliated service company, such cost being estimated at not exceeding $250 for each applicant-declarant.

No further action by any regulatory commission, other than this Commission, is necessary to carry out the proposed transactions. The Public Utilities Commission of New Hampshire has issued an order authorizing the notes proposed to be issued by Granite.

Notice is further given that any interested person may, not later than March 17, 1960, at 5:30 p.m., request the Commission in writing that a hearing be held on such matter, stating the nature of his interest, the reason for such request, and the issues of fact or law, if any, raised by said joint application-declartion which he desires to controvert; or he may request that he be notified if the Commission should order a hearing thereon. Any such request should be addressed: Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington 25, D.C. At any time after said date the joint application-declaration as filed or as amended, may be granted and permitted to become effective as provided in Rule 23 of the rules and regulations promulgated under the Act, or the Commission may grant exemption from its rules as provided in Rules 20(a) and 100, or take such other action as it may deem appropriate.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2249; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:47 a.m.]

TARIFF COMMISSION

[7-87]

CAST-IRON FITTINGS FOR CAST-IRON SOIL PIPE

Notice of Investigation and Hearing

Investigation instituted. Upon application of the Cast Iron Soil Pipe Foundation and others, received February 23, 1960, the United States Tariff Commission, on the 7th day of March 1960, under the authority of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, instituted an investigation to determine whether cast-iron fittings for cast-iron soil pipe, classifiable under paragraph 327 of the Tariff Act of 1930, are, as a result in whole or in part of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting concessions granted thereon under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

Public hearing ordered. A public hearing in connection with this investigation will be held beginning at 10 a.m., e.d.s.t., on May 31, 1960, in the Hearing Room, Tariff Commission Building, Eighth and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C. Interested parties desiring to appear and to be heard at the hearing should notify the Secretary of the Commission, in writing, at least five days in advance of the date set for the hearing.

Inspection of application. The application filed in this case is available for public inspection at the office of the Secretary, United States Tariff Commission, Eighth and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C., and at the New York office of the Tariff Commission, located in Room 437 of the Custom House, where it may be read and copied by persons interested.

Issued: March 8, 1960.

By order of the Commission.

[SEAL] DONN N. BENT,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2243; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:46 a.m.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Office of the Secretary

ALABAMA

Designation of Area for Production Emergency Loans

For the purpose of making production emergency loans pursuant to section 2(a) of Public Law 38, 81st Congress (12 U.S.C. 1148a-2(a)), as amended, it has been determined that in the following counties in Alabama a production disaster has caused a need for agricultural credit not readily available from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible sources.

ALABAMA

Baldwin.	Pike.
Barbour.	Mobile.
Chambers.	Randolph.
Chilton.	Shelby.
Clay.	Talladega.
Crenshaw.	Tallapoosa.
Lee.	

Pursuant to the authority set forth above, production emergency loans will not be made in the above-named counties after June 30, 1960, except to applicants who previously received such assistance and who can qualify under established policies and procedures.

Done at Washington, D.C., this 7th day of March 1960.

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2251; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:47 a.m.]

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Maritime Administration

TRADE ROUTE 18

Notice of Adoption of Conclusions and Determinations Regarding Essentiality and United States Flag Service Requirements

Notice is hereby given that the Maritime Administrator has adopted as final his tentative conclusions and determinations regarding the essentiality and United States flag service requirements of Trade Route No. 18 as published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of January 28, 1960 (25 F.R. 731).

By order of the Maritime Administrator.

Dated: March 8, 1960.

JAMES L. PIMPER,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2265; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:49 a.m.]

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

FOURTH SECTION APPLICATIONS FOR RELIEF

MARCH 8, 1960.

Protests to the granting of an application must be prepared in accordance with Rule 40 of the general rules of practice (49 CFR 1.40) and filed within 15 days from the date of publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

LONG-AND-SHORT HAUL

FSA No. 36066: *Salt cake from Hopewell, Va., to the south.* Filed by O. W. South, Jr., Agent (SFA No. A3921), for interested rail carriers. Rates on salt cake, in carloads from Hopewell, Va., to Fernandina, Fla., Brunswick and St. Marys, Ga., and Charleston, S.C.

Grounds for relief: Market competition.

Tariff: Supplement 129 to Southern Freight Association tariff I.C.C. 1538.

FSA No. 36067: *Substituted service—CRI&P for Interstate Motor Freight System.* Filed by Middlewest Motor Freight Bureau, Agent (No. 223), for interested carriers. Rates on property loaded in highway trailers and transported on railroad flat cars (1) between Kansas City (Armourdale), Kans., and Des Moines, Iowa, (2) between Kansas City (Armourdale), Kans., and St. Louis, Mo., and (3) between St. Paul (Inver Grove), Minn., on the one hand, and Council Bluffs, Des Moines, Iowa, and Kansas City (Armourdale), Kans., on the other.

Grounds for relief: Motor-truck competition.

Tariff: Supplement 128 to Middlewest Motor Freight Bureau tariff, MF-I.C.C. 223.

FSA No. 36068: *Petroleum—Rapid River, Mich., to Mich. and Wis. points.* Filed by Western Trunk Line Committee, Agent (No. A-2114), for interested rail carriers. Rates on petroleum and petroleum products, in carloads from Rapid River, Mich., to points in Michigan and Wisconsin.

Grounds for relief: Market competition.

Tariff: Supplement 39 to Western Trunk Line Committee tariff I.C.C. A-4198.

FSA No. 36069: *Substituted service—C&NW for Merchants Motor Freight, Inc., et al.* Filed by Middlewest Motor Freight Bureau, Agent (No. 222), for interested carriers. Rates on property loaded in highway trailers and transported on railroad flat cars between Council Bluffs, Iowa, and St. Paul, Minn., on traffic originating at or destined to points beyond as described in the application.

Grounds for relief: Motor-truck competition.

Tariff: Supplement 128 to Middlewest Motor Freight Bureau tariff, MF-I.C.C. 223.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] HAROLD D. MCCOY,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2252; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:47 a.m.]

[Notice 276]

MOTOR CARRIER TRANSFER PROCEEDINGS

MARCH 8, 1960.

Synopses of orders entered pursuant to section 212(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and rules and regulations prescribed thereunder (49 CFR Part 179), appear below:

As provided in the Commission's special rules of practice any interested person may file a petition seeking reconsideration of the following numbered proceedings within 20 days from the date of publication of this notice. Pursuant to section 17(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, the filing of such a petition will postpone the effective date of the order in that proceeding pending its disposition. The matters relied upon by petitioners must be specified in their petitions with particularity.

No. MC-FC 62881. By order of March 2, 1960, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to Marc's Delivery Corp., Philadelphia, Pa., of Permit No. MC 75152, issued July 29, 1958, to Hub Transportation Co., Inc., Wilmington, Del., authorizing the transportation of: Such general merchandise as is dealt in by retail department stores, from Philadelphia, Pa., to Delaware City, Del., serving all intermediate points on the designated highways and the off-route points in Delaware north of Delaware City, and from Philadelphia, Pa., to points in Delaware and New Jersey within 25 miles of Philadelphia, Pa.; and such merchandise as is dealt in by retail department stores and mail-order houses, from Wilmington, Del., to points in Caroline, Cecil, Harford, Kent, Queen Annes, and Talbot Counties, Md.; those in Chester, Delaware, and Lancaster Counties, Pa.; and those in Atlantic, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, and Salem Counties, N.J., as restricted. Jacob Polin, P.O. Box 317, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa., for applicants.

No. MC-FC 62790. By order of March 2, 1960, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to Hashem Bros. Trucking Co., Inc., Worcester, Mass., of Certificate No. MC 46020 issued May 20, 1955, in the name of Thomas Hashem and George Hashem, a partnership, doing business as Hashem Bros. Trucking Co., Worcester, Mass., authorizing the transportation over irregular routes of structural steel, from Worcester, Mass., to points in New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island and Connecticut; textile products, sheet metal and plumbing supplies, from Worcester, Mass., to points in Rhode Island and Connecticut; and machinery, between Worcester, Mass., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey. George Hashem, 172 Grafton Street, Worcester, Mass., for applicants.

No. MC-FC 62858. By order of March 2, 1960, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to Nichols Transfer & Storage Company, a corporation, Tulsa, Okla., of a portion of Certificate No. MC 66990 and Certificate No. MC 66990 Sub 5 issued July 20, 1956 and November 22, 1957, respectively, in the name of Don Eaton Transfer & Storage, Incorporated, Tulsa, Okla., authorizing the transportation of household goods, as defined by the Commission, over irregular routes, between points in the Chicago, Ill., Commercial Zone, as defined by the Commission, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Alabama, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Mississippi, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee; between points within 50 miles of Kay County, Okla., including those in Kay County, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, New Mexico, and Texas; between points in Lawrence County, Ill., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, and Ohio; and general commodities, excluding household goods, commodities in bulk, and various specified commodities, between points within three miles of Ponca City, Okla., including Ponca City. Russell A. Eaton, P.O. Box 822, Tulsa, Okla., for applicants.

No. MC-FC 62900. By order of March 2, 1960, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to Leo John Fairbanks, doing business as Fairbank's Express, Hoosick Falls, N.Y., of a portion of Certificate No. MC 68908, issued August 10, 1959, to Mullen Bros. Inc., of North Adams, North Adams, Mass., authorizing the transportation of: General commodities, excluding household goods, and other specified commodities, between Pittsfield, Mass., and Hoosick Falls, N.Y., serving all intermediate points on designated highways, and between North Adams, Mass., and Williamstown, Mass., serving the intermediate points of Greylock and Blackinton, Mass. John J. Brady, Jr., 75 State Street, Albany 7, N.Y., for applicants.

No. MC-FC 62909. By order of March 2, 1960, the Transfer Board approved

the transfer to Schroll Transportation, Incorporated, East Hartford, Conn., of Certificates in No. MC 1485 and MC 1485 Sub 3, issued May 12, 1958 and November 4, 1959, respectively, to Frank C. Schroll, doing business as Schroll Transportation Company, East Hartford, Conn., authorizing the transportation of: Meats, packinghouse products and commodities used in packinghouses, and fish and frozen foods, restricted against the transportation of such commodities in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Boston, Mass., to Bristol, Meriden, Torrington and Waterbury, Conn., from East Hartford, Conn., to points in Mass., and Rhode Island; and from Hartford, Conn., to points in Conn. and Mass.; sea foods and smoked meats from Boston, Mass., and points within 5 miles thereof, to points in Conn.; empty food containers from points in Connecticut to Boston, Mass., and points within 5 miles thereof; and Hampden Co., Mass., to Hartford, Conn., and from points in Conn., to points in 3 counties in Conn., meats, groceries, sea foods, fruits and vegetables, machinery, automobile parts and accessories, babbit, tin, acids, empty drums and carboys between Boston, Mass., and points within 5 miles thereof, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Connecticut; automobile parts and accessories, acids, empty drums and carboys between Worcester, Mass., on the one hand, and on the other, specified points in Connecticut; meats: The substitution of transferee for transferor in No. MC 1485 Sub 4. Thomas W. Murrett, Joseloff, Murrett & Throwe, Attorneys; 410 Asylum Street, Hartford 3, Conn.

No. MC–FC 62910. By order of March 2, 1960, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to Burns Moving and Storage Company, Inc., Natchez, Miss., of Certificate No. MC 110874 Sub 1, issued February 28, 1950, to Charles M. Burns and F. Conner Burns, doing business as Burns Transfer & Storage Co., Natchez, Miss., authorizing the transportation of: Household goods, as defined, between Natchez, Miss., and points in Mississippi within 50 miles of Natchez, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Louisiana. John T. Green, P.O. Box 222, Natchez, Miss., for applicants.

No. MC–FC 62924. By order of March 2, 1960, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to Jack H. Boone, doing business as Boone Transfer, Route 1, Parkersburg, W. Va., of Permit in No. MC 106007, issued November 19, 1959, to Cecil E. Johnson, doing business as Johnson Trucking, Route 2, Parkersburg, W. Va., authorizing the transportation of: Such commodities as are dealt in by chain retail and mail order department stores, the business of which is the sale of general commodities, between Parkersburg, W. Va., and points in Ohio within 25 miles of Parkersburg.

No. MC–FC 62934. By order of March 2, 1960, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to Charles Jacobs, Milbank, S. Dak., of Certificate in No. MC 46159, issued January 28, 1959, to LeRoy W. Call, doing business as LeRoy's Transportation Company, Madison, Minn., authorizing the transportation of: General commodities, with the usual exceptions including household goods and commodities in bulk, between points in South Dakota within 25 miles of Nassau, Minn., on the one hand, and, on the other, Minneapolis, St. Paul, and South St. Paul, Minn. A. R. Fowler, 2288 University Avenue, St. Paul 14, Minn., for applicants.

[SEAL] HAROLD D. McCOY, *Secretary.*

[F.R. Doc. 60–2253; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:47 a.m.]

[No. 33341]

DELAWARE, LACKAWANNA AND WESTERN RAILROAD CO.

New Jersey Intrastate Passenger Fares; 1960

At a session of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Division 2, held at its office in Washington, D.C., on the 4th day of March A.D. 1960.

It appearing that by petition filed February 9, 1960, with the Interstate Commerce Commission, The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company seeks authority to increase its basic and commutation fares for intrastate traffic within the State of New Jersey to the same level as those prescribed by this Commission for interstate traffic in Docket No. 32946, Increased Passenger Fares—Lackawanna Railroad (an embraced proceeding) in Increased Commutation Fares, Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, 308 I.C.C. 119;

It further appearing that petitioner filed petitions with the Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey seeking the same basic and commutation fare increases on intrastate traffic in the State of New Jersey, which increases were denied in toto by its decision of February 1, 1960 (NJ–PUC–594–11260);

It further appearing that petitioner avers that the failure of the New Jersey Board to increase its passenger fares within the State of New Jersey causes undue and unreasonable preference and advantage to persons and localities in intrastate commerce, and undue prejudice and disadvantage to persons and localities in interstate or foreign commerce, and undue, unreasonable and unjust discrimination against interstate commerce in violation of Section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act;

It further appearing that the Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey on February 29, 1960, filed a reply to the said petition;

And it further appearing that there have been brought in issue by the said petition passenger fares made or imposed by the authority of the State of New Jersey:

It is ordered; That in response to the said petition, an investigation be, and it is hereby, instituted, and that a hearing be held for the purpose of giving the respondent hereinafter designated and any other persons interested an opportunity to present evidence to determine whether pertitioner's present basic and commutation fares made or imposed by the State of New Jersey, cause, or will cause, any undue or unreasonable advantage, preference or prejudice, as between persons or localities in intrastate commerce, on the one hand, and interstate or foreign commerce, on the other hand, or any undue, unreasonable, or unjust discrimination against, or undue burden on, interstate or foreign commerce, in violation of section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act; and to determine what fares and charges, if any, or what maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum, fares and charges shall be prescribed to remove the unlawful advantage, preference, prejudice, discrimination, or undue burden, if any, that may be found to exist;

It is further ordered, That The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company be, and it is hereby, made the respondent to this proceeding; that a copy of this order be served upon such respondent; and that the State of New Jersey be notified of this proceeding by sending copies of this order and of the said petition by certified mail to the Governor of said State and to the Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey at Trenton, N.J.;

It is further ordered, That notice of this proceeding be given to the general public by depositing a copy of this order in the office of the Secretary of the Commission at Washington, D.C., and by filing a copy with the Federal Register Division, Washington, D.C.

And it is further ordered, That this proceeding be assigned for hearing at such time and place as the Commission may hereafter designate.

By the Commission, Division 2.

[SEAL] HAROLD D. McCOY, *Secretary.*

[F.R. Doc. 60–2254; Filed, Mar. 10, 1960; 8:47 a.m.]

CUMULATIVE CODIFICATION GUIDE—MARCH

The following numerical guide is a list of the parts of each title of the Code of Federal Regulations affected by documents published to date d uring March. Proposed rules, as opposed to final actions, are identified as such.